

JEWISH ESCHATOLOGY, EARLY CHRISTIAN
CHRISTOLOGY
AND THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE
PATRIARCHS

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL STAFF

C.K. BARRETT, Durham—P. BORGÉN, Trondheim

J.K. ELLIOTT, Leeds—H.J. DE JONGE, Leiden

J. SMIT STIBINGA, Amsterdam

Editorial Secretary: M.J.J. MENKEN, Heerlen

VOLUME LXIII





h. a. Lange

JEWISH ESCHATOLOGY,
EARLY CHRISTIAN CHRISTOLOGY
AND THE TESTAMENTS OF THE
TWELVE PATRIARCHS

COLLECTED ESSAYS
OF
MARINUS DE JONGE



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1991

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lc number 90-23295

ISSN 0167-9732
ISBN 90 04 09326 5

© Copyright 1991 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 27 Congress Street, SALEM MA 01970, USA. Fees are subject to change.

CONTENTS

Foreword, by H.J. de Jonge	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction, by Marinus de Jonge	xi

PART I. ESCHATOLOGY AND CHRISTOLOGY

I. The Expectation of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon	3
II. The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future According to the Qumran Scrolls	28
III. Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes	48
IV. The Use of <i>ho Christos</i> in the Passion Narratives ..	63
V. The Use of the Expression <i>ho Christos</i> in the Apocalypse of John	87
VI. The Earliest Christian Use of <i>Christos</i> : Some Suggestions	102
VII. Jesus' Death for Others and the Death of the Maccabean Martyrs	125
VIII. Jesus, Son of David and Son of God	135

PART II.

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

IX. The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	147
X. The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	164
XI. Levi, the Sons of Levi and the Law, in <i>Testament Levi</i> X, XIV-XV and XVI	180
XII. Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?	191
XIII. Hippolytus' "Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses" and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs ..	204

XIV. Two Interesting Interpretations of the Rending of the Temple-Veil in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.....	220
XV. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Christian and Jewish. A Hundred Years after Friedrich Schnapp.....	233
XVI. The Testament of Levi and "Aramaic Levi".....	244
XVII. The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus.....	263
XVIII. Die Paränese in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und in den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen...	277
XIX. Test. Benjamin 3:8 and the Picture of Joseph as 'a Good and Holy Man'	290
XX. Rachel's Virtuous Behavior in the Testament of Issachar	301
A Bibliography of the Writings of Marinus de Jonge 1953-1990, by H.J. de Jonge.....	314
Indexes	327

FOREWORD

This book appears on the occasion of Marinus de Jonge's sixty-fifth birthday and of his retirement as Professor of New Testament and Early Christian Literature at Leiden University. He has served the University and the Faculty of Theology from the summer of 1966 to the end of 1990, for almost twenty-five years. During this quarter of a century he has inspired appreciation, respect and friendship, both in students and colleagues, by the work he undertook as a teacher, researcher, author and administrator.

Marinus de Jonge (students speak of him simply as 'M') cannot exactly be called a genius at typewriting. This has not prevented him, however, from writing a vast body of scholarly work. The bibliography at the end of this volume may give an impression of the extent of this oeuvre. As an indication of the recognition De Jonge has gained as a scholar, it may be recalled that the international *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* chose him as its President for the year 1985-1986.

When the day of De Jonge's valedictory lecture, January 25, 1991, approached, a number of his colleagues and friends in the Leiden Faculty of Theology felt that they should compensate themselves in some way or other for his departure. They decided to do so by compiling a volume of his occasional essays. The essays were selected from two of the fields of research that have benefited from De Jonge's *pia curiositas*: early Christian christology and the study of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The author himself was invited to contribute an introductory note in which to sketch the main lines along which his scholarly interests and insights have developed in the course of forty years of research. Happily, the firm of Brill was willing to produce and publish the volume.

All members of the Leiden Faculty of Theology wish to take this opportunity to express their gratitude to Professor de Jonge for the support he has given them and for the work he has done for the Faculty, for theological studies in the Netherlands and for the study of the New Testament and early Christian literature. Their best wishes accompany this *Festschrift*, meant as a token of esteem and sympathy. They also wish to thank Vera for the backing she has always given to her husband. This retirement is well-earned – for both of them.

Leiden, July 1, 1990.

H.J. de Jonge, editor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The essays collected here were first written for the following publications: I: *Neotestamentica* 23 (1989), 93-117. II: O. Michel *et alii*, edd., *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969), 44-63. III: O. Betz, K. Haacker, M. Hengel, edd., *Josephus-Studien* (FS O. Michel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 205-219. IV: J. Dupont, ed., *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium 40; Gembloux/Leuven: Duculot/Leuven University Press, 1975), 169-192. V: J. Lambrecht, ed., *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium 53; Gembloux/Leuven: Duculot/Leuven University Press, 1980), 267-281. VI: *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986), 321-343. VII: T. Baarda, A. Hilhorst *et alii*, edd., *Text and Testimony* (FS A.F.J. Klijn; Kampen: Kok, 1988), 142-151. VIII: S. Draisma, ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings* (FS B.M.F. van Iersel; Kampen: Kok, 1989), 95-104. IX: *New Testament Studies* 26 (1980), 508-524. X: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17 (1986), 196-211. XI: J. Doré, P. Grelot, M. Carrez, edd., *De la Tôrah au Messie. Mélanges H. Cazelles* (Paris/Tournai: Desclée & Cie, 1981), 513-523. XII: J.W. van Henten, H.J. de Jonge *et alii*, edd., *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (FS J.C.H. Lebram; Studia Post-Biblica 36; Leiden: Brill, 1986), 150-162. XIII: *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 245-260. XIV: *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 350-362. XV: *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 39 (1985), 265-275. XVI: *Revue de Qumran*, nos. 49-52, tome 13 (1988), 367-385. XVII: *Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985), 157-170. XVIII: H. Merklein, ed., *Neues Testament und Ethik* (FS R. Schnackenburg; Freiburg/ Basel/Wien: Herder, 1989), 538-550. XIX: J.W. van Henten, ed., *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (Studia Post-Biblica 38; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 204-214. XX: D. Balch *et alii*, edd., *Greeks, Romans and Christians* (FS A.J. Malherbe; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990).

For permission to reprint articles I wish to thank: Professor P.G.R. de Villiers, former editor of *Neotestamentica*, and the New Testament Society of South Africa (I); Van Gorcum & Comp. and the Stichting Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamen-

tum (II); Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (III); Éditions Duculot and Leuven University Press (IV and V); the editors of *New Testament Studies* and Cambridge University Press (VI and IX); Uitgeversmaatschappij J.H. Kok (VII and VIII); Desclée Éditeurs (XI); the editors of *Bijdragen. Tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie* (XIII and XIV); Uitgeverij Boekencentrum (XV); Éditions Gabalda (XVI); Verlag Herder (XVIII) and Augsburg Fortress (XX).

Thanks are also due to the editors of Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* for accepting this volume for inclusion in their series.

Finally, I want to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to E.J. Brill Publishers, and their deputy director Ms. M.G.E. Venekamp, M.A., for their willingness to publish this volume.

H.J. de Jonge

INTRODUCTION

by

M. DE JONGE

This introduction, written at the request of the editor of this volume, attempts to indicate the place of the respective essays in my research over forty years – the period between the beginning of the work on my doctoral dissertation in 1950 to my retirement from the chair of New Testament and Early Christianity in the Faculty of Theology of the University of Leiden on the last day of 1990. This undertaking requires a brief sketch of the various trends in that research and some indication of developments in my approach, viewed in retrospect. I do not intend to present such a thing as a scholarly autobiography – an impossible undertaking for one who hopes to continue his explorations and does not feel that he has reached a point at which he is able to give an in-depth survey of his previous work. Also, the essays in this volume have been reprinted as they were originally published; no attempt has been made to update them.

It is appropriate to begin with the essays IX-XX on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, a subject that has occupied me since my student days at Leiden. In my dissertation, written under the supervision of J. de Zwaan and T.W. Manson during an inspiring year at Manchester University (1951-1952), I dealt with the text, composition and origin of this document (see no. 1 in the bibliography at the end of this volume). The book appeared in July 1953 when only the major finds of the first Qumran cave had been published. Its thesis that the *Testaments* were a Christian document using diverse Jewish material and had to be dated around A.D. 200 was received critically by a number of scholars engaged in research on the Dead Sea Scrolls, but accepted by J.T. Milik and others. The boom in Qumran research led to a continuous interest in the *Testaments*; in consequence also my dissertation received attention. It was eventually reprinted in 1975. As a result I had to engage in a debate with my opponents. A first modest attempt to do so was my lecture at the In-

ternational Congress on the Four Gospels, held at Christ Church, Oxford, in September 1957 (see no. 22). A more fundamental attempt at tackling the main issues involved was the critical discussion of the views of M. Philonenko and A.S. van der Woude in a long article 'Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' published in 1961 (see no. 23). The question of the relationship between the Greek Testaments and Aramaic and Hebrew material found at Qumran and elsewhere has continued to occupy me (see, e.g., no. 52). The article of 1988 reprinted here as essay XVI (= no. 84) gives my latest assessment of the (unfortunately still incomplete) material.

The articles listed as nos. 22 and 23 were written in a country manse away from the university. In the meantime W.C. van Unnik and K. Aland had encouraged me to make a beginning with a new edition of the Greek text of the *Testaments* and offered me help in procuring microfilms. The every-day work as a minister, however, did not leave much time for reading manuscripts (in which I had never received any training), and it was not until my appointment as lecturer in the Faculty of Theology of the University of Groningen (1962) that I could find time and received help to make a proper start. The first result was what I prefer to call an *editio minima*, consisting of a diplomatic edition of the very important Cambridge manuscript brought to Britain on the initiative of Robert Grosseteste around the middle of the thirteenth century. I provided the Greek text with a modest apparatus for which the data were taken from R.H. Charles's edition of the *Testaments* of 1908. It appeared in 1964 as the first volume in the new series 'Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece,' edited by A.-M. Denis and myself (see no. 2; a corrected edition appeared in 1970).

This small edition went back to a provisional text made during my work on my dissertation, when I discovered that the presuppositions behind Charles's edition were highly questionable and that real advance in the study of the *Testaments* would only be possible on the basis of a newly constituted text.

After my appointment to the Leiden chair in 1966, considerable progress on the new edition of the Greek text was made possible by the financial support of the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.) and the important help of a number of assistants, among which H.J. de Jonge, Th. Korteweg and H.W. Hollander have to be singled out. Starting off as assis-

tants they soon became partners, not only sharing in the work (which was considerable), but also taking responsibility for scholarly contributions of their own. This is evident from the essays in the volume *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* published in 1975 (no. 9) and from the *editio maior* of 1978 (no. 12). The former volume mentioned includes *inter alia* eleven studies on codicology and textual criticism, a survey of early research on the *Testaments* before J.E. Grabe, editor of the *editio princeps* of the Greek text (1698), and several studies on the interpretation of the *Testaments* (among them reprints of nos. 23 and 52).

By the autumn of 1978, then, our hands were free to continue research on the *Testaments* on the basis of the long-awaited edition of the Greek text. H.W. Hollander finalized his research on the ethics of the *Testaments* resulting in his doctoral thesis *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (StVTPs 6), Leiden 1981. In the meantime I had started work on 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints' for *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (written in 1979, revised in 1984, and finally published in 1987 – see no. 81). A short version of it was presented to the Durham meeting of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas in 1979 (see no. 66), where it met with stimulating criticism and positive response. It is reprinted as essay IX in this volume, as the first of a number of recent articles on the *Testaments*. The other essays came into being as the spin-off of the work on a commentary on the *Testaments* by Hollander and myself in the period 1980-1984 (again with considerable financial help by Z.W.O., which enabled Hollander to work on it full-time for two years). The publication of *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* in 1985 (see no. 14) constituted a mile-stone, but not the end of a long path of research.

The studies reprinted here as essays X-XX deal with a number of related subjects. They all attempt to show that there is more consistency in the *Testaments* than literary critics of the old school (active right to the present day!) were inclined to admit. In particular these contributions want to demonstrate that the overtly Christian passages cannot be removed without damaging the texture of the texts involved. This leads to the conclusion that, whether or not Jewish 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' ever existed (and in whatever form), they cannot be reconstructed on the basis of the Christian *Testaments* of the end of the second century A.D. that have been

handed down to us (see essay X = no. 79; XI = no. 67; XII = no. 80, and also XVI = no. 84 and XIX = no. 87).

In this respect the point of view defended in 1953 was confirmed with some nuances in argumentation. Gradually, however, another line of approach forced itself upon me – supplementing rather than replacing the one followed previously. If the *Testaments* were composed, or heavily redacted, at the end of the second Christian century, the opinions of the patriarchs of the pre-Mosaic period must have been of some importance for their authors and their readers. They presuppose the continued relevance of the Jewish Scriptures as the Old Testament of the Church (see essay XV = no. 72). Hence I studied Hippolytus' *Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses* anew (essay XIII = no. 74) and looked for parallels to the two (different) interpretations of the rending of the temple-veil at Jesus' death in the *Testaments*, especially in the period before Origen (essay XIV = no. 75). Particularly interesting proved to be an analysis of the views of Justin and Irenaeus (as well as Tertullian) concerning God's commandments both in the time before Moses and in the time after the coming of Jesus Christ (essay XVII = no. 71). I noticed that these authors assumed a continuity between the pre-Mosaic commandments and the essence of God's law as taught by Jesus. I also observed that there was substantial agreement between these essential commandments on the one hand and ethical ideas found in Jewish Wisdom literature and Hellenistic popular philosophy on the other. These observations led to further studies on the ethics of the *Testaments* (essay XVIII = no. 86 and essay XX = no. 92).

I hope to continue along these lines, consistently comparing the contents of the *Testaments* with ideas found in early Christian sources of the period before Constantine. All so-called pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament have, in their present form, come down to us through Christian channels and were regarded as relevant for Christian readers. Modern interpreters will have to take this basic fact seriously.

On the other pseudepigrapha I have not written much. I wrote an article on the *Vitae Prophetarum* (no. 24); I acted as co-editor of two series: 'Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece' (no. 94) and 'Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha' (no. 96); finally, I edited a volume *Outside the Old Testament* in the series 'Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 B.C. to A.D. 200' (no. 101). My work on the *Psalms of Solomon* will

have to be discussed in the next section.

The essays I-VIII are connected with my studies on Jewish expectations concerning the future, particularly the expectation of an 'Anointed One' (or 'Anointed Ones'), and with those on early Christology. It all began with an invitation of A.S. van der Woude during my four years at Groningen to join him in writing the section on *chriō*, *christos* in Jewish sources in the article devoted to these terms in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. My relatively short contribution appeared, after much delay, in 1973 (followed by an English translation in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* in 1974; see no. 49). Many more studies followed, some of them published earlier than the article in the dictionary, working out points that could only be mentioned very briefly there. Eventually, the various lines of research in this field resulted in a monograph *Christology in Context. The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus*, published in 1988 (see no. 15) and followed by the Shaffer Lectures at Yale Divinity School (1989), published under the title *Jesus, the Servant Messiah* (no. 16, compare no. 17).

But let me follow the course of my research step by step. On my appointment as Reader in the Groningen faculty in 1965, I delivered an inaugural address on the expectation of the future in the *Psalms of Solomon* (see no. 3). Dr. Pieter G.R. de Villiers kindly translated it into English and published it (with some additional comments) in *Neotestamentica* of 1989 (see no. 88; compare also no. 73). It now appears as essay I in this volume. Next came a contribution to the *Festschrift* for G. Sevenster, whom I succeeded as professor at Leiden, a contribution devoted to the intriguing problem why 'Christos' became such a central term in early Christianity whilst it is very seldom used in Jewish contemporary literature. The *Festschrift* appeared at the same time as an issue of *Novum Testamentum*, and thus my 'The Use of the Word "Anointed" in the Time of Jesus' (see no. 30) attracted the attention of some other scholars and was quoted several times. I also ventured out into the field of Qumran studies, first together with Van der Woude (see '11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament,' no. 28), and next on my own in 'The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future according to the Qumran Scrolls' (no. 39, now essay II in this volume). Five years later, in my contribution to the Michel *Festschrift* (no. 50, now essay III in this volume), I discussed Josephus' attitude

towards 'messianic' movements in the first century of the common era.

In the meantime I had started investigations into the use of the word *christos* in early Christianity. As I was engaged in research on the Johannine writings (on which I shall report below) I first dealt with the use of this central title in the Johannine Epistles (no. 40) and next with that in the Fourth Gospel (no. 45 – a lecture given at the S.N.T.S. meeting at Claremont in 1972). At the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense of 1973 I gave a seminar on the use of *ho christos* in the passion-narratives, especially in Mark (no. 55, now essay IV) and six years later a lecture on its use in the *Apocalypse* of John (no. 65, now essay V). Again six years later, in my presidential address to the S.N.T.S. meeting at Trondheim, I attempted a preliminary synthesis under the title 'The Earliest Christian Use of *Christos*. Some Suggestions' (no. 77, now essay VI). Two articles written especially for *Festschriften* followed, both dealing with themes mentioned in the Trondheim address: one, on Jesus as prophetic Son of David, written in Dutch for the Van der Woude *Festschrift* (no. 82), looked back on our earlier common work, while a very recent one on the connection between the titles Son of David and Son of God, was written in honour of Van Iersel (no. 91, now essay VIII).

This survey has covered all essays included in the first part of the present volume, with the exception of essay VII (= no. 85) 'Jesus' Death for Others and the Death of the Maccabean Martyrs,' which was written in 1988 in honour of A.F.J. Klijn. It was the outcome of discussions in the small Leiden department for New Testament on Jewish and early Christian martyrology (see also no. 87, = essay XIX in this volume). It is also related to chapter 11 ('Jesus' Death, Resurrection, and Exaltation') of my book *Christology in Context* (no. 15) and to chapter 3 ('Jesus' Mission and his Death on the Cross') of my book *Jesus, the Servant-Messiah* (no. 16). In these two chapters the various early Christian interpretations of Jesus' death are treated more broadly.

This brings us back to the two recent books on Christology which form the end of a chain of articles. They also presuppose a number of earlier studies on the 'Quest of the Historical Jesus' and (connected with it) the nature of early Christian speaking about Jesus. In 1955 I had started, rather innocently, with a survey article on some recent British studies on the Life of Jesus, in which I discussed *inter alia* the views of T.W. Manson in his *The Servant Messiah*, Cambridge

1973, and expressed my admiration for this interesting common sense approach to the subject (see no. 19, my first publication after my dissertation). Shortly after that the situation altered with the developments in the school of Bultmann and the reactions to the so-called 'New Quest' on the part of other scholars. I reported on that in a number of articles (nos. 21, 26, 138, 36), but soon the scope of the discussion widened when the nature of the *kerugma* concerning Jesus and its relevance for to-day received more attention, now also outside the circle of specialists. I commented on J.A.T. Robinson's *Honest to God* (no. 135) and cautiously explored the use of other literary genres, especially of narrative, in early Christian speaking about Jesus (nos. 141, 34). In 1971, in my book *Jesus, inspirator en spelbreker* (no. 6), a number of these essays (nos. 138, 135, 141, 34) were brought together along with other articles on communication of the Christian message (nos. 134, 143-144); the book included also a study on 'Jesus as a revolutionary' (a popular subject at the end of the sixties), and some further essays. The book was translated by John E. Steely and published in the United States under the title *Jesus: Inspiring and Disturbing Presence* (no. 8). I have been told that it appeared in Argentina as *Jesus: Inspirador y Aguafiestas*, but I have never seen a copy (nor has my Dutch publisher).

There is a direct link between the explorations which finally led to *Jezus, inspirator en spelbreker* and the first two chapters of *Jesus, the Servant-Messiah*. T.W. Manson's book mentioned above went back to his Shaffer Lectures given in 1939; lecturing fifty years after Manson I tried to map out how New Testament scholarship developed during that period and how this has affected our present views on Jesus and his own 'Christology.' Also the sketch of the evolution of early Christology in *Christology in Context* could not have been written without the earlier explorations into the nature of Christian speaking about 'the One with whom it all began.'

All along it was brought home to me, on numerous occasions and in several ways, that research in early Christianity requires the tools and abilities of the philologist, the literary critic, the historian and the theologian. Also my work as a pastor, preacher, teacher, leader of discussions and other activities in a conference-center, and, at a later stage, as a Bible translator, has helped me to understand better the problems and opportunities facing the early Christian communities as they tried to communicate the message entrusted to them in adequate words (and actions). At various occasions I have discussed

the problems involved, looking at them from various angles, particularly in articles for a more general audience. I may point here to my inaugural lecture at Leiden (no. 4), to articles as diverse as nos. 36, 68, 134, 139, 143, 148, 170, and to the collection of essays in M. de Jonge and H.M.J. van Duyne, *Van tekst tot uitleg*, that appeared in 1982 (no. 13).

Very important for me has proved the participation in a committee of translators preparing translations of New Testament books in contemporary Dutch (see no. 93) and the co-operation with C. Haas and J.L. Swellengrebel (a linguist and experienced translator) on *A Translator's Handbook on the Letters of John* (no. 7). Interpreting a text in such a way that it is really 'brought home' to a person in his or her own situation, be it an 'ordinary' Dutch person or someone in an entirely different cultural situation, requires not only teamwork, but also a great sensitivity to the problems encountered in communication. The fourth section of the bibliography lists a number of small articles explaining and defending the methods used by translators of the United Bible Societies (methods which are by no means commonly accepted in my country). Of more importance (to me at any rate) were a number of articles in which I explained and practised a type of structural analysis of difficult texts which I had learned from fellow-translators (see nos. 56-57, 63, 69, 76, 175). I mention these activities and their outcome not because of their scholarly importance, but of their significance for my own activity as a literary critic and historian.

A last category of studies to be mentioned here – though not represented by any of the essays incorporated into this volume – are those resulting from my work on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles. In this field I started off with a number of articles for a general audience in 1956, listed as nos. 108-109, followed by a series of fifteen-minute radio broadcasts in January-May 1957. During my preparations I had profited very much from C.H. Dodd's *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge 1953, and from C.K. Barrett's commentary *The Gospel according to St John*, London 1955. In an article for non-specialists, written in 1956 (no. 114), I showed my enthusiasm for the ideas of these authors. After these preliminaries I started work on a commentary on the Johannine Epistles at the invitation of P.A. van Stempvoort, who was editor of the Dutch series 'De Prediking van het Nieuwe Testament' and my senior col-

league for New Testament at Groningen in 1962-1966. The commentary appeared in 1968 (no. 5), and was three times revised in the following twenty years. In 1972 it was followed by the *Translator's Handbook* written together with C. Haas and J.L. Swellengrebel which was already mentioned (no. 7).

One cannot study the Johannine Epistles without continually looking at the Gospel. Fascinated by the unity and flexibility in Johannine thought, and by the developments in the Johannine communities between the Gospel and the first Epistle, I began to study the Christology of these writings. A number of articles followed (many of them going back to lectures for which I had received invitations) – see nos. 35, 37, 40, 41, 45-48, 54, 59-60, 61. Some of them were in 1977 collected in a volume entitled *Jesus, Stranger from Heaven and Son of God*, edited (and partly translated) by John E. Steely (no. 10). On the basis of this H.M.J. van Duyne and myself published a book in Dutch for a more general audience called *Taal en Teken. Ontmoetingen met Jezus in het evangelie van Johannes* (no. 11). In the meantime I had myself edited the papers read at the 1975 Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense of which I had the honour to be the chairman (see no. 100). Further Johannine studies are listed as nos. 51, 56-57, 58, 62, 83; to these should be added a number of articles of a more popular nature which need not be summed up here. I hope to continue working on Johannine literature and to publish a small size commentary on the Gospel before long. Johannine research, again, requires a combination of literary and historical criticism with theological reflection on problems of communication and language.

Leiden, 1 July 1990.

PART I

ESCHATOLOGY AND CHRISTOLOGY

THE EXPECTATION OF THE FUTURE IN THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON*

ABSTRACT

The "intertestamental period" sheds important light on the Christology of the New Testament and the preaching of Jesus. The expectation of the future in Jewish faith is focussed upon with special reference to the 17th and 18th Psalms of Solomon. The image of the "Anointed of the Lord" and the future expectation of the "Son of David" in view of Pompey's invasion of Palestine are of great importance to the understanding of the usage of the title Messiah/Christ in the Gospel and Acts.

A study of the New Testament presupposes a study of the world in which the different New Testament documents originated, and of the environment in which Jesus, his followers and his opponents lived. In addition to this, a study of the Old Testament confronts us with the question of how the various motifs of faith, and the conceptions, which we find in these collected works, developed within the context of the Jewish people after the Old Testament had been completed. The study of the history and literature of Judaism in the period which stretches approximately from 200 BC to 100 AD occupies a very meaningful area within the framework of the historical critical research of the Bible. The period is, for the sake of convenience, but nonetheless incorrectly so, described as the "intertestamental" period.

This study does not only afford interesting historical information and striking background detail, which although useful, is not essential - but renders an essential contribution towards the understanding of the preaching of the New Testament and to some Old Testament documents. No one can therefore write on the Christology of the New Testament without studying in depth the problem of the meaning and function of different names and expressions connected with Jesus in related earlier and contemporary literature. He must ask, further, whether there have been figures, other than that of Jesus of Nazareth, which people have approached with so much expectation, reverence and rejection.

*This article is a translation by Pieter G R de Villiers of Marinus de Jonge's inaugural lecture as reader in the University of Groningen in 1965. The text was originally published as *De toekomstverwachting in de Psalmen van Salomo* (Leiden: Brill). Because of the special nature of this article, it was decided to retain as much as possible of the original Dutch format, which included extensive footnotes.

The question to be asked is whether the writers of the New Testament documents, the followers of Jesus - yes, Jesus himself, were influenced by people, events and documents of their own time, either by accepting and making use of various ideas, or by rejecting certain notions against which they then preached. Insight into the interaction between the preaching about Jesus in different New Testament documents on the one hand, and the conceptions of people from the same or somewhat earlier period on the other, is of paramount importance for the correct understanding of that preaching. As an example, and there are many others, I refer to Ferdinand Hahn's treatment of the titles, Son of Man, Lord, Messiah/Christ, High Priest, Son of David, Son of God and Prophet, in his *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (1963) in which he not only talks about "Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum" (as the subtitle reads), but in which he also finds himself compelled to involve the Old Testament and the intertestamental period in his investigation.

What applies to the Christology naturally also applies to other facets of the preaching of the New Testament and the latter parts of the Old Testament. A thorough study of the intertestamental period is indispensable to a scientific research of the Bible.

In the Jewish faith and thought *circa* 200 BC-200 AD, the expectation of the future¹ played a great part in certain smaller, quasi-sectarian groups, in which the apocalyptic documents originated (note in particular Beek 1950:55-69; Van Andel 1955 and Plöger 1959:37-68, especially 60-68, but see also 34-36). Man looked forward to the great day on which it would become clear that the Lord God would not let go the work of his hands (cf Ps 138:8), the day on which He would bring about the final turning-point in the course of history. Man expected a future in which the will of God would triumph and in which the law, the concrete embodiment of God's will, would be obeyed in practice by the people of Israel and all those who trusted in the Lord. It was the time in which the unfaithfulness towards God and opposition against the plans of God, within and without Israel, would come to an end.

The concepts which express this future expectation are complex indeed. Within the writings and sections of writings, which must be viewed as a unity, numerous expressions and symbols are to be found in juxtaposition in a quite unsystematised manner. The point at issue here is not a rational objective explanation, but a symbolic, often visionary-symbolic expression of an expectation of an event which, at most, has analogies with, but no parallels in the past. Famous researchers like Volz (1934), Klausner (1956) and Mowinkel (1956) attempted to systematise the concepts and to explain them in their essential meaning. But it became clear that a systematic approach was not applicable, as there appeared to be as many exceptions to the rule as there were cases in which the rules held true.

We must, therefore, be very cautious in our description and characterisation of the various elements in the Jewish expectation of the future. We can state differences and similarities in the usage of symbols in

the explication and application of Old Testament material and in the influence of non-Jewish concepts, but we must remember that the literature which we try to analyse derives not from philosophers or theologians, but from visionaries and followers of visionaries, who were poets rather than historiographers². Their language was more of a referring nature than it was descriptive and defining. We cannot trace the essential characteristics of the Jewish expectation of the future by analysing it in its literary form in a dogmatic-classifying way. We may succeed, however, if we try to understand the context of experience and the faith of the groups in which this expectation existed and developed in different ways.

New information in this field is becoming available. I refer particularly to the scrolls and fragments found at the Dead Sea, which do not only afford an insight into the Messiah concept of the community at Qumran, but which also throw new light on the Messianic expectations in other groups and in writings of the intertestamental period. In his dissertation Van der Woude (1957a) made an important contribution to this field. New, surprising evidence becomes available almost daily (by way of speaking), as is illustrated in his publication of new fragments from the so-called eleventh cave in Qumran (Van der Woude 1965).

In this essay attention is given especially to the future expectation as depicted in the Psalms of Solomon. The choice fell on these psalms because, in the first place, their representative material, primarily derived from the Old Testament, is comparatively easy to analyse; secondly, they are to be dated, in accordance with the opinion of the majority of researchers, approximately in the middle of the first century BC; thirdly, the image of the Anointed of the Lord in the 17th and 18th Psalms is of great importance towards understanding the usage of the title Messiah/Christ in the Gospels and Acts (of the many publications on this subject, I refer to Manson 1953, in particular chapters 1 and 3).

The Psalms of Solomon is the name of a collection of eighteen songs³, which in many ways resemble the Psalms in the Old Testament. They probably originated between circa 70 and 40 BC amongst the people who called themselves "the pious and holy"⁴. These are usually taken to be Pharisaic groups, but it is not at all certain that this identification is the correct one⁵. The Psalms are preserved in a Greek and in a Syriac version which originally derived from a Hebrew version, now lost⁶. There is nothing substantial which reveals any relationship to King Solomon as known to us from the Old Testament. For chronological reasons it is completely out of the question that these songs could have been composed by the historical Solomon, but neither were they composed by an unknown poet or poets under the pseudonym of the great king from the past⁷. The present title must have originated with those who collected the Psalms⁸. They were led to this choice by the remark in 1 Kings 4:32 that Solomon did not only write 3 000 proverbs but also composed 1 005 songs. The 17th and 18th Psalms base their

hope on the house of David from which an ideal, God-pleasing king would be born. What could be more obvious than to ascribe this collection of Psalms to the son and successor David? In the Old Testament Book of Psalms there were, in addition to the many Psalms of David, indeed only two songs ascribed to Solomon, namely Psalm 72 and Psalm 127.

This can be seen in conjunction with what Ludin Jansen (cf Ludin Jansen 1937 and also Holm-Nielsen 1960:1-53) wrote on the milieu and the function of the late Jewish Psalms, to which the Psalms of Solomon belong. Solomon is to be seen as the wise one par excellence⁹, and Ludin Jansen, who also discovered in the Psalms of Solomon various influences from the Old Testament wisdom literature, suggests that these songs originated in the circles of Scripture-studying pious ones who felt themselves to be inspired by what had been said by the writers of the Psalms, by the Prophets and the wise ones of Scripture. These songs served to admonish and to strengthen the pious who met in houses, in synagogues and probably also in the temple in Jerusalem, to confess their faithfulness to the God of Israel and their obedience to his Torah¹⁰.

The future expectation of the pious ones in the Psalms of Solomon forms one facet and at that an important facet of their faith in the God of Israel. Their vision of the future is closely bound up with their vision of God's acts in the present and the past and, naturally, also with their conception concerning God's demands: in other words, with the interpretation of God's law accepted within the group. The later Messianic expectations have two main sources according to Klausner (1956:384): decisive historical events and Holy Scripture. By trusting on the God who concluded his covenant with Israel, and studying Scripture, man tried to trace the intention of God with the present events and in this way strove to see present and future in the light of God.

Which decisive historical events are alluded to in the Psalms of Solomon and how are they interpreted? For the most part the Psalms speak only in general of the themes which were important for the pious ones, for example the contrast between the life of the pious person and that of the sinner (Ps 3;13;14;15); hypocrites and blasphemers (Ps 4;12); God's actions in the creation (Ps 5); the blessings of prayer (Ps 6); God's righteousness, his chastisement, punishment and forgiveness (Ps 2; 7; 8; 9; 10; 13; 16). They also speak of the redemption which God promised his people, especially in Psalms 11, 17 and 18. In the expectation of these themes traditional Scriptural motifs play an important part (Klausner: "Holy Scripture!"). Various motifs from Isaiah 40-55¹¹ appear in Psalm 11 (a short psalm which sings of the return to Jerusalem of Israel, dispersed amongst the peoples). It sees the return as a sign of God's mercy over Israel and of the victory of his power (compare also 8:28; 17:(18),26,31,44). In Psalm 11 there is no clear allusion to historical events. In Psalms 2, 8 and 17¹² there are, indeed, such allusions but here one must reckon with the role played by traditional images

and expressions, derived largely from Scripture. The authors do not want to write history. They are composing psalms.

Therefore, Psalm 8 describes the great Roman, Pompey, who in 63 BC, at the request of different Jewish parties, directly intervened in Palestinian affairs and occupies Jerusalem¹³ (with the result that Israel come permanently under Roman rule), as one sent by God, to punish the sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (vs 1-2; 15). The eyes of the Jewish rulers seemed blinded by a spirit of error sent by God (v 14). Therefore, they welcome the Romans (vs 16-17) who would subsequently shed the blood of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, kill the leaders and the wise men and take their children into exile (vs 20-21). God chastises his people through Pompey. The believer recognises God's intention and ventures, on the ground of this chastisement, to appeal to God's faithfulness and God's mercy (vs 33ff). He prays (verses 27-30):

*Turn, O God, thy mercy upon us
And have pity upon us
Gather together the dispersed of Israel
with mercy and goodness,
For thy faithfulness is with us
and though we have stiffened our neck
Yet Thou art our Chastener.
Overlook us not, o our God
Lest the nations swallow us up
As though there were none to deliver.¹⁴*

Another description of the great Roman general is given in Psalm 2, which must have been written later than Psalm 8. Indeed, the heathen came to punish the sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (1). In their arrogance, the alien troops even penetrated to the altar, because the sons of Jerusalem defiled that too (4-13). Jerusalem has been insulted and dishonoured. The author describes the city as a woman in mourning garments (19-21). But the heathen went beyond the limits set by God. They were not led by zeal for the cause of God, but by greed and lust (24). This is unacceptable to God, and the poet, therefore, asks Him to intervene. He need not wait long before he sees the destruction of the dragon (Pompey).

Verses 26-27:

*And I had not long to wait
before God showed me the insolent one
slain on the mountains of Egypt
esteemed of less account than the least on land and sea;
His body too, borne hither and thither
On the billows, with much insolence;
With none to bury him¹⁵.*

This is a true reflection of the reports concerning the end of Pompey¹⁶. Fleeing from Caesar, after the battle at Pharsalus in 48 BC, Pompey hoped to

find asylum in Egypt, but at the moment before he set foot on shore, he was treacherously murdered. His decapitated corpse was left naked on the shore and, after some time, it was burned on an improvised funeral pile by some faithful followers. According to Dio Cassius, all this took place at the mountain Casion (also named Cas(s)ius) in the neighbourhood of Pelusium, on the way from Egypt to Palestine. It is understandable that the sudden, horrible death of the great Pompey made a deep impression, so that Psalm 2:26-27 describes the downfall of Pompey as a punishment of God. The Scriptural motifs in this description are, once again, very conspicuous: Pompey is called a "dragon", just as the Pharaoh in Ezekiel 29:3 and 32:2, Nebuchadnezzar in Jeremiah 51:34 and (later) the anti-godly power in the Revelation of John 12 and 13 (cf also Rv 16:13 and 20:2). In Ezekiel 32:5 (cf 4; 27:5), we read that God will lay down the flesh of the Pharaoh on the mountains; in the LXX version of Isaiah 14:19 it is prophesied to the king of Babel that he would be cast away on the mountains together with many who descend to the underworld, after having met their fate through the sword. According to Psalms of Solomon 2:28-30, Pompey forgot that he was but a human being. He proclaimed himself as lord over earth and sea and did not recognise God as Supreme King, upon whom all rulers are dependent. The same is said of the king of Babylon in Isaiah 14 and of the Pharaoh in Ezekiel; also of Antiochus Epiphanes in Daniel 11:40-45, whose end, according to Daniel, would come during a campaign against Egypt¹⁷.

Thus, the events of the time are described in traditional symbolic terms. Events are also seen as part of a powerful world-drama led by God, in which, at times, mythical beings such as dragons, monsters and fantastic animals, play a large part. Already in Isaiah 27, for example, God's victory over the world powers is described as the "conquering of the Leviathan", a monster from primeval times (for further examples in apocalyptic writings, see Russel 1964:123-127). As distress increases, it becomes more difficult to remain faithful to the Lord, and, as more and more fellow-countrymen turn away from the Lord and collaborate with the godless heathen, man hopes fervently for the denouement, the final act of the world-drama.

In this regard the Psalm of Solomon 17 is very instructive. In this psalm it is clear how closely the present and the future are entwined. By deducing God's intention from the events, one concludes that the decisive turn which will be brought about by God, cannot be far off. At the beginning of this psalm we meet once again the well-known theme of God's righteous punishment for the godless (10) by means of a lawless enemy (11). However, this is at once connected with another motif, namely that of God's Kingship (this motif we find in the PssSol only here and in 2:30 and 5:18,19). The psalm starts (1) and ends (46) with the hymn of praise that God is our King to all eternity. And on this mighty King weak men may put their trust. This God is a Redeemer. He is merciful and He will show his Kingship by judging the nations (2-3). In verse 4 the motif of God's Kingship is connected with

God's promise that there will always be a descendant of David on the throne of Israel. The poet returns to this promise later in verse 21, when he sings of the action of the expected ideal Son of David but, already at the very beginning of this song, this motif plays a part in the description of the sins of the sinners: they have, though God did not promise them anything, arbitrarily usurped the royal power and caused the throne of David to stand empty and deserted¹⁸. This must refer to the rulers of the Hasmonean dynasty. To punish them God sent a stranger, Pompey. He did his job thoroughly. There is an allusion to how some important Jews accompanied Pompey in this triumph in Rome¹⁹.

But the stranger is arrogant, as Psalm 2 has underlined already: His heart is far from God. God will not be able to tolerate this any longer, He must take steps. Therefore, the passionate prayer: God, make haste to send the promised Son of David! Verse 45 therefore says explicitly: God will hasten his mercy upon Israel. He will deliver us from the uncleanness of unholy enemies²⁰.

The description of the fate of the pious ones, which precedes the description of the action of the expected Davidic King is noteworthy. There is no one left in Jerusalem who puts righteousness, mercy and truth into practice (15,19). Men from the highest to the lowest violate the Law of God (20). Those who love the meetings of the pious ones must flee and roam through deserts, just as the pious ones did in the time of the Maccabees, the community of Qumran and numbers of other fighters for the holy cause of God²¹. As in the days of Elijah no rain falls and the springs give no water (cf 1 Ki 17-18; Sir 48:3; Hg 1:10,11 and AssMos 10:6; 4Ez 6:24). The poet says:

*Behold, O Lord and raise up unto them their King, the Son of David at the time which Thou knowest O God, that He may reign over Israel, Thy Servant (21)*²².

The pious remind God of his Word. God has promised that there will never be a Son of David wanting in Israel (4). He is faithful and therefore man may pray to Him to free Israel through a Son of David and to cleanse it of all uncleanness and unrighteousness.

I would, in this regard, like to stress the fact that here the present and future merge into each other. The expectation is one of the imminent reversal of fortune. This is so because man has detected in the present and immediate past God's punishing and rescuing hand, and because man sees that God's work has not yet been completed. Man hopes for and trusts in the completion of that which has already begun. In this way the future has already become the present and precisely because of this, man yearns more deeply for that which is still to come. Man knows that he is included in a series of drastic and decisive events, in which God is working unmistakably and unavoidably on the realisation of his intentions with Israel, with the nations and with the whole world. New Testament scholars have, in recent years, often discussed the problem which is indicated by the terms

"Naherwartung" and "realised eschatology". It seems to me that to shed new light on the arguments used in this discussion, they should be analysed in the light of the renewed study of the relationship between present and future in the Jewish expectation of the future during the intertestamental period. This could possibly lead to the conclusion that a number of the discussed problems were only fictitious²³.

The promise of God to David is a theme which is strongly accentuated in the Old Testament; Psalm of Solomon 17:4 refers to the so-called "prophecy of Nathan" in 2 Samuel 7, in which the continuity in the covenantal relationship between the Lord and the house of David is underlined. Of this prophecy, Von Rad said that it

in höchstem Masse traditionsschöpferisch geworden (ist), denn diese Zusage Jahwes ist nie mehr vergessen worden; sie ist in der Folgezeit immer neu interpretiert und aktualisiert worden; hier liegt der geschichtliche Ursprung und die Legitimation auch aller messianischer Erwartungen (Von Rad 1957:309, but read 304-351. Cf also Amsler 1963).

One can question the word "aller"²⁴, but it is true that some songs which tell of the King (the so-called "Royal" Psalms 2,18,20,21,45,72,89,101,132) and prophecies which are connected with the House of David, or a figure of that house (e.g. Am 9:11; Hs 3:5; Is 9:1-6; 11:1-10; Mi 5; Jr 23:1-8; 33:14-26; Ez 34:23f; 37:24-28; Hg 2:21-24; Zch 4 cf 6:9-15) are based on the trust of God's promise to David and his descendants. They describe an ideal picture which has its base not in real life but in the promise of God. And, with special reference to the future expectation: the less man detects a realisation of this promise in the present, the more he yearns for God to send the son of David in the future - the one in whom God's promises to David would be fully realised.

Psalm of Solomon 17:21-46 stands fully in this tradition, just as Psalm of Solomon 18 does. In the description given here of the expected King from the seed of David, there are, indeed, and understandably so, many pronouncements incorporated from the above-mentioned Old Testament passages. Thus this King is called in verse 32 "Anointed of the Lord"²⁵, a designation used for the king in the Old Testament and especially in the royal Psalms. It is striking that this expression is never used in the Old Testament for a king or any other person to appear in future. This usage is found for the first time in the intertestamental period, and the Psalm of Solomon 17 is one of the first passages in which this term is used in this way²⁶. In addition, there is no question of it being used as a technical term, "the Messiah". In the first place this term is not yet used absolutely and in the second place nothing more is said other than: "For all shall be holy and the King an Anointed of the Lord" (32), just as his predecessors in the past. Psalm 18, which is clearly secondary in comparison with Psalm 17, and which should perhaps also be dated later, uses this "Anointed of the Lord" as more or less a technical term for the expected ruler²⁷.

It is important to notice that this figure of a royal Anointed of the Lord, is mentioned only in Psalm 17 and Psalm 18. In Psalm 11 it is God Himself who will bring about the release and the return of the dispersed Jews to Israel. Also in other psalms, which relate a future intervention of God (Ps 7:10; 8:27-31; 10:5-8; 12:6; cf 9:8-11; 14:9,10; 15:12,13) no Anointed is mentioned. For the expectation of the future, as it is delineated in the Psalms of Solomon, it is thus indeed essential that God proves his mercy and his power by intervening in the course of events, but it is not essential that he uses an ideal King elected by Him. Whether a writer incorporates in his description of the future such a figure or not, depends on his choice from the material in the Old Testament or other sources. One could use the David-texts, but one was not compelled to do so²⁸.

In the Old Testament many prophetic passages do not mention David and his descendants at all. In the literature of the intertestamental period the figure of an ideal Davidic King is certainly not as dominant as is often assumed. In the Psalms of Solomon one can see that even within one collection of related songs, the function of the Anointed of the Lord can be interpreted in different ways. In addition, the term "Anointed" can indicate other figures than the Son of David, for example the High Priest, who is expected in Qumran, in addition to the King (cf on this, in addition to the studies mentioned in note 26, also Van der Woude 1957a).

In connection with the vision of the future Redeemer, or other mediators of God's salvation, the Jewish future expectation knows a large variety of concepts, which makes systematising a perilous matter. It is almost as with different mosaics where one needs to discover how, for every pattern and sometimes even for parts of one pattern, different tiles were used and how they were arranged.

How does the poet of Psalm of Solomon 17 see the person and the task of the promised Son of David? I would like to draw attention only to the following essential points (for the use of Old Testament material in this section of PssSol, cf in addition to the commentaries, also Chevallier 1958:11-17): The first is that the kingship of the Son of David is a kingship by the grace of God. God sends this King (21,42). He is, and stays King of the world, of Israel and also of the king of Israel (2:30,32; 5:18,19; 17:21). In no way does the Kingship of the Son curtail the Kingship of God. Psalm 17 begins and ends with a hymn of praise on the kingship of God (1,46)²⁹. The Anointed is the ideal servant no more (as also in the corresponding parts of the Old Testament, cf e.g. De Boer 1958 and Amsler 1963:75).

There is a second point connected with this one. The rule of the expected Son of David will be realised in Jerusalem and in Palestine, the promised land. He will cleanse Jerusalem of heathen and sinners and will drive them out and destroy them (22-25,30,36). A sanctified people will live in Palestine. Evildoers will no longer be found there and strangers will not live there (26-29). The rule of the King will be extended further over the whole earth and

all peoples. They will serve under his yoke (30) and will come to Jerusalem to see the glory which God will give to the King and to Jerusalem. The exhausted children of Israel will be gathered from the dispersion and brought home³⁰.

Here too the aim and intention is not the setting free of the people or the destruction of internal and external enemies - even though the expectation of the future hinged largely on the hope of an end to all oppression. It is the realisation of God's purpose on this earth, thoroughly cleansed and totally changed by God, with Jerusalem as its centre. Although the expectation has national, political and even military facets, it is concerned primarily with theocracy, the realisation of God's rule over all peoples, groups and nations.³¹

The third point which I would like to accentuate, is that the poet of Psalm 17 describes the King, not in the first place as a fighter or a ruler, but as an ideal scribe, a wise man par excellence as Solomon, the hero of the circles in which these psalms originated³². There is in reality only one reference in this psalm to violent action against the enemies. This is, however, a traditional motif taken from Psalm 2:9; from the context it is clear that the psalmist sees a particular godly power at work. I refer here to verses 23-24; compare also 22a, where the second and third lines were inspired by Psalm 2:9:

Wisely, righteously, He shall thrust out sinners from the inheritance. He shall destroy the pride of the sinner as a potter's vessels. With a rod of iron he shall break in pieces all their substance. He shall destroy the godless nations with the word of his mouth.

The fourth line refers to Isaiah 11:4 which is echoed in 17:35,36 ("with the word of his mouth" is found also in the LXX. The Hebrew text has "the rod of his mouth"). Military operations are not necessary. The King has only to speak and his enemies are defeated, to threaten and the peoples flee (25). By the power of his word, he will judge the rulers and expel the sinners (36). But he surpasses all this; He is the King of whom is dreamt in Deuteronomy 17:16,17:

He will not put his trust on horse, rider or bow, and he will not multiply for himself gold or silver to wage war (33).

The expected Ruler will be taught by God Himself (32). He will be inspired by the Holy Spirit (37;18:7). He will judge and rule righteously (26f,29,32,36f,40f) and then in a distinctive way. Verse 43 says

His words shall be more refined than costly gold, the choicest. In the assemblies³³ He will judge the people, the tribes of the sanctified. His words shall be like the words of the holy ones in the midst of sanctified peoples³⁴.

The tribes of Israel will once again live in the land (28,36,44). All the people will be holy and there will be no unrighteousness anymore (27,32).

It is clear that the expectation of the realisation of God's rule on earth is directly connected with the vision of the Torah of God, which was nurtured in the group of pious Jews in which the Psalms of Solomon originated. What

Beek said of the apocalyptic writings is true also of these psalms: "All apocalyptic originated from the world of the Old Testament and unfolded in the circles of those who were deeply concerned with the instruction as well as with the promise which had been given to Israel" (Beek 1950:4. Cf also Rössler 1960:45-54).

One last remark by way of conclusion - salvation would be realised here on earth, and therefore at the human level. But the King and his subjects possess superhuman attributes. There is no mention of the death and succession of the Son of David, nor of his eternal existence. The wise men were exclusively interested in the imminent turning-point in history, and this they described in symbolic terms. Words were inadequate to express what was soon to come to pass. What men longed for was to be granted soon. Truth and enduring values were to be fully realised. God's power would be victorious as promised. God was King in all eternity³⁵. This was all to be manifested in no uncertain terms, and therefore how it was conceived was of secondary importance³⁶.

According to the Gospel of Luke, an angel proclaimed to the shepherds that unto them a Redeemer, Christ the Lord, had been born in the city of David (Lk 2:10,11). The primitive Christian community witnessed to the fact that Jesus of Nazareth was the anointed of the Lord, and in Him the expectation connected with David was fulfilled. In Him God's Kingship on earth became manifest. It is not the task of the historian to decide whether this testimony is "true". But when his research on the intertestamental period seeks to discover what this testimony meant, how it was understood by those who heard it for the first time, and wherein the similarities and differences in the thought of the Christian community and contemporary Jewish expectation are to be found, his contribution is indispensable.

POSTSCRIPT

In its original Dutch form this article originated in the summer of 1965. Grateful as I am to Prof Pieter de Villiers for translating it and having it published in this journal, I feel it cannot appear after twenty four years without some additional comments.

For recent publications on the Psalms of Solomon one may consult Charlesworth (1981:195-197; 303-304), and Schürer et al (1986:192-197). Given the recent revival of interest in pseudepigraphical literature, contributions on the Psalms of Solomon are not numerous. I myself investigated the Psalms of Solomon again in De Jonge (1985:159-177).

The most thorough recent treatment of the Psalms of Solomon is the one by Schüpphaus (1977). He assumes two stages of redaction. A nucleus consisting of Psalms 1/2,8 and also 4,7,11,12 in their original form and parts of Psalms 5 and 9, originated as synagogal prayers in the situation of crisis and distress immediately after Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem in 63 B C. Later, in the period between 48-42 B C, the psalms in this collection were

a different time" (Hann 1985:626). This certainly applies to the conceptions in the individual psalms; as I argued above there is a difference in use of the expression "the anointed one" in Psalm 17 and 18. But does it also apply to the Greek wording? Most likely the whole collection of psalms was translated into Greek at the same time; consequently Psalm 18:5 may be used to establish the wording of Psalm 17:32. Hence I keep the translation "the anointed of the Lord"; I see no reason why the definite article should be used.

END NOTES

- 1 This term is not sufficiently explicit: it does not concern the attitude one has in general towards events which are to take place, but rather the expectation of the decisive turning point in history which will be brought about by the intervention of God. Yet, I prefer this broader concept to other formulations which are too limited.

The frequent use of the term *messianic expectation* e.g. suggests that mention is always made of a Messiah, an Anointed one. And because this is not so, as will be seen below, one tends to use the word messianic in a wider, symbolic sense. Klausner (1956) does this when he e.g. distinguishes between "Messianic expectation" and "belief in the Messiah". His definition of the first is: "The prophetic hope for the end of this age, in which there will be political freedom, moral perfection, and earthly bliss for the people of Israel in its own land, and also for the entire human race" (9). The word "eschatological" must *stricto sensu* be limited to the expectations which are coupled with the concept of the end of this world and that of a beginning of a new (or renewed) world. But because this concept is not always expressed, or better still: because the transition from "end" to "new beginning" can be illustrated in many ways, and a decisive and irreversible intervention by God can be posited where the gulf between old and new is not accentuated sharply, the term "eschatological" leads to misunderstanding. Moreover, it demands a distinction between and within the content of the messages of the different prophets and apocalyptists, (see e.g. Mowinckel 1956: chapters 5 and 8), which is more important for the analysis of the different components in the future expectation, than for a description of its essence. See further also Von Rad (1960:125-132), and note 36 below. The interdependence of terminology and theory is clear also from Vriezen (1954:363-386): "The Kingdom of God in the future expectation". Of particular interest is his distinction between "specific messianic expectations" and "general expectations of salvation" (364), the connection of the first expression with "all prophecies which contain a person as figure of salvation" (365) and finally his distinction between pre-eschatological, proto-eschatological, imminent (or "sich realisierend") eschatological and transcendent eschatological (380). See also Schubert (1964:1-54), with an outline of recent literature in the note on 42.

- 2 This is rightly emphasised by Wilder (1958-1959:229-245), who writes: "Ancient eschatological texts are, as literary remains, undecoded hieroglyphs and enigmas unless we are able to recreate the world of experience of which they are only ambiguous tokens. Modern study of biblical eschatology is constantly confronted with problems as to the proper interpretation of the cosmic and transcendental language" (229) and: "We urge that, especially for our greater texts, full recognition be given to the operation of the "mythical mentality", in all its creative and quasi-magical power. In the second place, we urge recognition of the sociological setting of the eschatology. The very impulse to such dualistic interpretation of the world-process rises out of a radical culture crisis in Judaism, but in addition the cosmic-eschatological language in many respects exhibits its relation to earthly situations, events and outcomes" (229-230). Of course not all authors were original and creative. A certain literary tradition developed in apocalyptic circles, just as in the case of the circles in which the Psalms of Solomon originated (see the studies of Ludin Jansen 1937 and Holm-Nielsen 1960). The words "original" and "creative" can also only partially do justice to the activity of the "greats" among the apocalyptic writers (and poets in other circles). Occupation with re-interpretation and actualising application of Old Testament data, especially of prophetic sayings (see the parallels mentioned in the commentaries on these writings) dominated. See on this *inter alia* Klausner (1956:384-386), and Beek (1950:9): "It is methodologically of no small importance to see these authors of the revelatory literature bowed over this Book".
- 3 Clearly there is a lack of coherence between Psalm of Solomon (hence PsSol) 18:1-9 and 18:10-12. Ryle and James (1891:147-148) presume that this is a case where fragments of two Psalms were joined together. It is noteworthy that Cod Vossianus Misc 15, which gives the text of PsSol 17:2 καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς to the end of PsSol 18 on fols 79a-82b (cf Baars 1961b:441-444), leaves out the διάψαλμα between verses 9 and 10 but adds: "Psalm of Solomon 19". This codex is late (16th century); do we have here the conclusion of a later copyist on the grounds of the same considerations which led Ryle and James to their theory? Von Gebhardt (1895:136) and Schürer (1909:209) draw attention to the fact that an Ode of Solomon (probably the first), which is only preserved in Coptic, is called the nineteenth "Ode". That indicates that a completed collection of 18 "Psalms" was known. See also Harris and Mingana (1916-1920:13) and Bauer (1933:1).
- 4 ὁσίοι is found in 2:36; 3:8; 4:1,6,8; 8:23,34; 9:3; 10:6; 12:4,6; 13:10,12; 14:3,10; 15:3,7; 16 title; 17:16. ἄγιοι in 11:1; 17:32(43).
- 5 See on this the extensive article by O'Dell (1961:241-257): "It is much more likely that the milieu out of which these psalms originated was that of the Chasidim. By Chasidim I do not mean a closed narrow party, but

rather a general trend of pious, eschatological Jews whose piousness was one of an individual nature rather than something imposed upon them by the group" (257). The last phrase is not quite clear, because one could conclude that the Psalms of Solomon were more likely a product of one pious person than of a group of pious law-abiders. In the following O'Dell expresses himself more clearly: "It is not necessary, indeed it is misleading, to dissect all Jewry of the intertestamental period into distinct religious and political groups. There were without a doubt a number of deeply spiritual and eschatologically oriented men who belonged neither to the Pharisees, Sadducees, nor to the priestly minded Qumran Essenes, but were nonetheless religious Jews. Such a man, or group of men, was the author of the Psalms of Solomon". The critique of Grelot on O'Dell (1962:19-50, especially 25-26) did not convince me, nor did the conclusion of Eissfeldt (1964:830-831). On 830 he writes: "Es ist vielmehr ein überall nachweisbarer Frömmigkeitstypus, der hier zu positivem und negativem Ausdruck kommt. Der Pharisäismus war gewiss von seiner Art, aber nicht allein".

- 6 The best critical edition of the Greek text remains the one by Von Gebhardt (1895), now to be supplemented with the material mentioned by Baars (1961b). The Syriac text is to be found in Harris and Mingana (1916-20, compare now also Baars 1961a). Kuhn (1937) tried to prove that the Syriac translation was made directly from the Hebrew and thus has the same value as the Greek. The arguments in favour of translation of the Greek text from the Hebrew, are to be found *inter alia* in Ryle and James (1891:77-78), and Viteau (1911:105-125). The most convincing argument is that retranslation into the Hebrew illuminates a number of obscure passages. Begrich (1939:131-164) rejected the thesis of Kuhn. According to him the Syriac text is a translation of a Greek manuscript which occupied such an important place in the Greek tradition, that the Syriac translation must be taken into account seriously in attempts to reconstruct the oldest Greek text.
- 7 The Psalms of Solomon cannot therefore *stricto sensu* be reckoned under the pseudepigrapha. Pseudonymity is a phenomenon of the intertestamental period; often seen as an essential characteristic of apocalyptic - cf e.g Russell (1964:127-139).
- 8 The name Solomon appears in the titles of the psalms (only the first psalm has no title). The question as to when the titles were written, has very seldom been discussed thoroughly in the literature (cf Viteau 1911:94-104). The titles are written in a Greek which is in any case Hebraising - see particularly the often repeated τῷ (Σαλωμών) which corresponds to the Hebrew שֹׁלֹמֹן. But since the Greek translation of the canonical Psalms also introduces the author's name in this way, one cannot infer from this fact a Hebrew origin for the titles. The same is true of the διάψαλμα after 17:29 and 18:9, which corresponds with the Hebrew יְהוֹשֻׁעַ. It is striking to

read in the title of Psalm 8 εἰς νῆκος while the psalmist speaks, not of victory, but of God's chastisement of Israel and of the capture of Jerusalem. The expression is in the LXX the translation of $\Pi\chi\Delta\Delta$ but appears in Theodotian in the title of Psalm 13:1 as the translation of $\Pi\chi\Delta\Delta\Delta$. That could be an indication that the titles stem from the Hebrew and are therefore old. One problem, however, is that it is difficult to determine how old the Greek translation is. Viteau proffers a date between 40 BC and 70 AD (140-149), but considers it improbable that the psalms could have been ascribed to Solomon before 70 AD. This could only be done when one could no longer recognise any references to historical contexts.

He has to presuppose therefore that a Hebrew text was still in use for a long time after the Greek translation came into being and that it influenced the translation later on. A very forced construction! Viteau and Ryle & James (1891:90-92) advance the following arguments for a translation into Greek directly after the composition in Hebrew. i) There are no signs of Christian revision or Christian interpretations (but see note 25). ii) To the translator the writing must have had a particular relevance - and this is not conceivable after the debacle of 70 AD (argument mentioned by Viteau only). iii) The resemblance with the language of the New Testament, specifically that of the Magnificat (Lk 1:46-55) and the Benedictus (Lk 1:68-79). iv) Ryle and James point out the dependence of Baruch 5 on PsSol 2. Viteau omits this argument because he does not consider this dependence proven (on this matter see below note 11). None of these arguments is very convincing, especially not the second one; it was precisely after 70 AD that SyrBar and 4 Ezra were written. Similarly the theory of Viteau that the PssSol could be ascribed to Solomon only after 70, is not tenable. The historical allusions are so general as to be used *mutatis mutandis* in all sorts of situations, and to ascribe the Psalms to Solomon on the basis of the fact that the PssSol reflect the reign of Solomon described in Kings and Chronicles, has never been possible. We will have to admit that we have too little information to come to a satisfactory conclusion in these matters.

- 9 The books Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Canticles are ascribed to him, and the apocryphal writing Wisdom of Solomon bears his name. In Kings (1 Ki 3:1-15) as well as in Chronicles (2 Chr 1:1-13) the episode of Solomon's prayer for wisdom occupies an important place. In 6 codices the PssSol are found with other (canonical and apocryphal) Wisdom books.
- 10 Compare the *Hodayot*, found at Qumran, but which have a much more personal character than the PssSol (cf Van der Woude 1957a:7-15), even if it is possible that here the poet(s) sees himself (see themselves) as typical member(s) of the congregation. See the survey of the discussion in Maier (1960:62-63), and Lohse (1964:109-110). Other songs and

fragments of songs from Qumran are mentioned by Eissfeldt (1964:890-891). Concerning the Psalms found in the so-called eleventh cave in Qumran, and related Syriac material, see Sanders (1964:57-75). Von Rad (1960:314-328), emphasises the influence of wisdom-speculations on apocalyptic. He underestimates the influence of prophecy, however, and thus gives a very biased description of apocalyptic.

- 11 See the survey by Ryle & James (1891:73). PsSol 2 displays many parallels with 2Bar 5. In an elaborate study, Pesch (1955:251-263) tries to prove that PsSol 11 must be dependent on 2Bar 5. Because the various related motifs in Baruch form a unity with those used in the context, and PsSol is a more stylised and rounded composition, it is impossible that 2Bar 5 is dependent on PsSol 11, while it is very improbable that two relatively short passages could use so many of the same motifs from the prophetic literature, independent of each other.
- 12 Aberbach (1950-1951:379-396) has also found historical allusions in Psalms 4:11 and 23. His argument is unconvincing.
- 13 See Abel (1952:255-264). Principal source: Josephus, *AntJud* 14:34-79; *BJ* 1:131-158.
- 14 Here (and elsewhere) the text and the verse-division of Von Gebhardt are used. God's judging activity has in fact two aspects: verses 22-25 refer to its manifestation in the punishment of the sinners; He judges the whole earth. As to the pious ones: they are as innocent lambs among the nations (23b). Quite unnoticed the assessment of God's judgment changes, when it is said in 26b: "For you are the God of righteousness, judging for all with chastening". According to Psalm 7, God chastises the pious one, who accepts that as a sign of God's mercy - see verse 5: "For you are merciful and will not be angry to the point of consuming us". Ultimately God, according to verse 8, will have mercy on the people of Israel, and this is why verses 9 and 10 see the purpose of the chastisement in God's decisive "showing mercy on the day on which you promised (to help them)". Continuing this line of thought the poet of Psalm 8 can appeal to God's mercy toward Israel in the conclusion. Compare also PsSol 18:1-9! For an extensive treatment of this problem, see Viteau (1911:51-56), and Braun (1950-1951).
- 15 In 26 τὴν ὑβριν is an *abstractum pro concreto*. Translation into the original Hebrew and the assumption of a corruption (יְהוֹרָג or יְהוֹרָג) rather than יְהוֹרָג "the courageous one" - according to G B Gray in Charles (1913, *in comm in loco*); or instead of יְהוֹרָג "his cadaver" - according to Perles (1902, col 276-277), is superfluous. ὑπὲρ ἐλάχιστον is a conjecture of Ryle & James and of Von Gebhardt. The MSS read ὑπὲρ ἐλάχιστου
- 16 See Abel (1952:305-307). Principal sources: Plutarchus, Pompeius 77-80; Dio Cassius, *HistRom* 42,2-5 (information on the place of Pompey's death in 42,5,6).

- 17 On the grounds of the use of traditional motifs one could even defend the viewpoint that PsSol 2:25ff is not to be seen as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, but as a genuine prediction.
- 18 As found in verses 5-6. Notice that the sinners were raised as a result of "our" sins, i.e. the sins of the people. The "to whom you did not promise (anything)" must be connected in the Greek with "sinners" (for another explanation, after translation back into Hebrew, see Gray in Charles 1913:*ad loc*). Verse 6a has more than one interpretation. I think verse 6b should be translated: "they made the throne of David empty and desolate in their arrogance, which manifests itself in a change". A change namely, which consisted of the usurpation of the royal title (see Kuhn 1937:58).
- 19 Verses 7-14 describe the lawless opponent. It is remarkable that the verbs in verses 7-9a are in the future tense (ἤλῃσεν in 9a is a conjecture, all MSS read ἐλῃσει). Often it is said that the aoristi as well as the futura in this section must be traced to a Hebrew imperfectum. That is quite possible, but still it remains conspicuous that the Greek translator changes the tense. Does it mean that the punishment for these particular sinners will go on until the bitter end (thus Viteau 1911:*ad loc*)? Kuhn (1937) argues for a later insertion (by the same author) of the verses 11-14. The Psalms would then be written before 63 BC after the lawlessness of Pompey became obvious. The "man who was alien to our race" in verse 7 must be the same as "the lawless one" in verse 11, namely Pompey (and not Herod, as has been suggested). It is possible that there could be an allusion to Dt 17:15 which forbids the appointment of a stranger as king, but refers to a king "from among thy brethren", "whom the Lord thy God shall choose". In PsSol 17:33 it is said that the ideal future king will submit to the rules given in Dt 17:16,17. There is an allusion to the triumph in verse 12 (ἐν ὀργῇ κάλλους) has, since Ryle & James been explained as a translation of a corrupt Hebrew text, which read יָפִי (his beauty) instead of יָפִיָא (his anger). According to Josephus, Aristobul with certain family members were taken to Rome (*AntJud* 14:79, *BJ* 1:154). It goes without saying that the words τὸ δερπίσιον remind one of a triumph. Notice the explicit mentioning of a leading away to the *West* that is to *Rome*.
- 20 The conjecture ῥύσονται instead of ῥύσεται is unnecessary. See further Gray in Charles (1913:*ad loc*) and the textcritical commentary of Kuhn (1937:78f).
- 21 Cf the useful summary of the information by Hengel (1961:255-261). Notice also the role of the desert in the ministry of various prophets, who were active in the first century in Palestine according to Josephus (cf Meyer 1957:826f). Notice the description of the pious in verse 16b (cf also 8:23).
- 22 Once again the conjecture of Von Gebhardt εἴλου is unnecessary; the reading οἶδα is to be preferred.

- 23 I cannot of course explicate this assertion in detail. Compare: Sevenster (1962) and (for a stimulating contribution to a new discussion on this material) Doeve (1962:32-38).
- 24 Compare Van der Woude (1964:especially col 1200). This article proves to be particularly useful in the orientation towards a survey of problems and theories. For the arguments of the Scandinavian school, consult Mowinckel (1956:1); a short survey is given by Ringgren (1956).
- 25 All Greek manuscripts read *χριστός κύριος* and the Syriac translation corresponds with this (see also Kuhn 1937:73f). In Ps 18 we find the expressions *χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ* (5), *χριστοῦ κυρίου* (7) and in the title *τοῦ χριστοῦ κυρίου*. The translation "Anointed of the Lord" ("his Anointed") is obvious and therefore in 17:32 an understandable mistake or a conscious correction of a Christian scribe has been supposed by many - compare Lam 4:20 LXX and varlect in Sir 47:11 (*χριστός* instead of *κύριος*), 2 Macc 3:30 (*χριστοῦ* instead of *κυρίου*) and the quotation from Is 45:1 by Barnabas (12:11). In contrast, Ps 110:1 and 51:10 are referred to for a possible analogous usage of the word *κύριος* (not of the expression *χριστός κύριος*, which appears only in Christian documents).
- 26 I refer for details to the above mentioned works of Volz, Klausner and Mowinckel. The last two devote much attention to the expectation in the Old Testament. Here mention can be made of the article *χρίω* ktl in *TWB* 9, 482-576, in which the Old Testament section is written by F Hesse, and that on later Judaism by A S van der Woude and M de Jonge.
- 27 The expressions are "against the appointed day when he brings forth his anointed one" (5) and "under the rod of chastening of the Lord's anointed" (7). It is not clear whether *ἀναξίς* means "bringing back" or "bringing upwards", "causing to rise". The collation, published by Baars (see note 3), of cod Vossius Misc 15 reads *ἀνέσει*. Manson proposed *ἀναδείξει* (see 1945:41f). That the expression *ἐτι τοῦ χριστοῦ κυρίου* is mentioned in the title, is insignificant, because the titles were added later (see note 8). In Psalm 18 too the term Anointed/Messiah does not appear without further qualification. Concerning the secondary character of Psalm 18, reference can be made to the repetition of different motifs from Psalm 17 in verses 5-10 and also of themes from earlier psalms (especially Ps 5:11; 14; 15; 13:9) in verses 1-4. In the whole section 1-9 the motif of God's *παίδεια* (see also note 14) is once again expressly connected with the motif of God's Anointed (compare also 17:42). Gry (1906:230-248) refers to Psalm 18 as "un pastiche de celui qui précède (232). He draws attention to the fact that the expectation in this psalm is much less intense than in Psalm 17; notice in particular that "in those days" is parallel to "for the coming generation" in 18:6, while the same expression in 17:44 is directly followed by the prayer to God to hasten his mercy (17:45). In the light of the two totally different parts of which Psalm 18 consists, (see

note 3), it must seriously be considered as a possibility that Psalm 18 was originally composed as a conclusion along with the other Psalms.

- 28 Compare Van der Woude (1964:1200): "Die Messiaserwartung ist daher eine spezifische Form und Konkretisierung der allgemeinen israelitischen Heilshoffnung ohne für die letztere eine unbedingte Voraussetzung zu sein. Viele Propheten und manche apokryphen und pseudepigraphischen Schriften erwähnen den Messias überhaupt nicht".
- 29 It is noteworthy that the "to rule over Israel your servant" in verse 21b can refer grammatically to God as well as to the expected king. See also the note of Viteau (1911:352-353) on the following verses.
- 30 Note in particular verse 34b "he will have mercy on all nations in fear before him". Many changes in the text were proposed, because this saying is difficult to reconcile with the following "he will smite the earth with the word of his mouth for ever" (see list in Kuhn 1937:75). But we must retain the reading as it stands here; if we consider "in fear before him" as an addition to the "all nations", then the sentence makes for a first-rate translation. The attitude towards the nations is obviously ambivalent. On the one hand they are to be destroyed and driven away; on the other they are very welcome in Jerusalem if they honour God and serve the king, whereupon they will participate fully in the gifts God bestows in his mercy and grace. There are many Old Testament motifs in these verses. Chevallier (1958:11-17) mentions especially Isaiah 11 and 49. In connection with verse 34b, Psalm 2:10-12 can be referred to, in addition to 2:8-9; see also verse 43c of this psalm.
- 31 Manson (1953:8f): "A war for Jewish freedom was also a holy war, a war for the kingdom of God. This consideration is important in view of the assertion that used to be made - and still crops up occasionally - that Jewish Messianic ideals were "materialistic" or "purely political" or "this-worldly". The kind of Jew who had Messianic ideals in this period did not make these abstractions. He believed in a God who was actively participating in the course of history, and consequently he saw himself as a subject of this divine king here and now. If he took up arms against the unclean Gentile, it was not just a political move, it was also a religious undertaking. The campaigns of Israel could be regarded quite naturally as the wars of Jehovah. Where the whole activity of man from the cradle to the grave is taken into the ambit of his religion, there is no place left for the "purely political" or the "merely materialistic". See also Klausner (1956:7-12).
- 32 Compare on this particularly Gry (1906:248): "Le Messie des Psaumes de Salomon est un Roi glorieux dans ses deux fonctions de guerrier et de juge: mais, c'est avant tout, l'homme idéal, le Pharisien sans reproches, celui que l'on devait justement attendre comme un digne chef des 'Hasidim'." See also Lagrange (1931:149-163), especially 156f.

- 33 Wolfson (1946-1947:87) remarks that συναγωγή must here refer to special meetings, "assemblies for administering justice".
- 34 The ἄγιοι according to the commentators are *angels*, as servants par excellence of God's holy will. An interpretation à la verse 32c has little sense. Notice how sanctified *nations* are mentioned alongside the one sanctified nation - see also verses 32,34b.
- 35 The conventional phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα appears very often in the Psalms of Solomon, in the general meaning "for ever". For an answer to the question which is being investigated here, the usage of this term is of no value. In 2 Sm 7:13,17; Ps 45:7; 89:5,30,37f it is explicitly the continuation of the *house* of David which is at stake.
- 36 The consequence of this is that in the scientific research on the multiplicity of motifs in the Jewish expectation of the future, one will have to lay more stress on the unity than on the diversity. On the whole one can distinguish two types of future expectation. M A Beek in his public lecture at Groningen on 29 January 1941, spoke of national and transcendent motifs (*Nationale en transcendente motieven in de Joodse apocalyptiek van de laatste eeuwen voor Christus*, Assen 1941); others write explicitly of two tendencies and described them with two extensive series of opposing epitheta. It is noteworthy that each scholar, having indicated the two tendencies, emphasizes that these two types of future expectation are never found as such. I cited as an example Mowinckel (1956), who said explicitly that one should differentiate between the two types, and e.g. criticized J Bonsirven, W Küppers and H Riesenfeld for omitting to do so (267 note 2). He never tires of stressing the fact that it is alone tendencies which exist combinations of aspects, and not systems - as on 271: "A new eschatology came into existence, dualistic, cosmic, universalistic, transcendental, and individualistic. But the old view and the new appear nowhere in the literature as two distinct systems: and they certainly never actually existed as such in the minds of individuals. They are always intermingled in a quite unsystematic combination, so that the main emphasis is put sometimes on the one aspect, sometimes on the other". In contrast to prevailing theories, Messel (1915) argued in favour of the unity. He, in fact, reduces all expectation to the original "nationale Zukunftshoffnung", which in some cases, however, uses new words and symbols. "Neue Ausdrucksformen, variierte Darstellungsmittel der alten nationalen Zukunftshoffnung, das und nichts anderes sind die Vorstellungen, in denen man Glieder einer neuen übernationalen und überirdischen Eschatologie erkennen zu dürfen meint. Zum Teil handelt es sich um Bilder, die unsere Forschung wörtlich genommen hat, zum Teil um Uebertreibungen des Ausdrucks, durch die man sich hat blenden lassen, zum Teil auch um neue Vorstellungen, deren nationalpolitischen Charakter man verkannt hat" (7).

Messel is biased in his reduction to one type but this does not minimize the fact that he has made many true observations. It is a great pity that he was in fact not given due credit. It would be advisable to review his material critically once again in the light of the remarks of Wilder (1958-1959).

WORKS CONSULTED

- Abel, F M 1952. *Histoire de la Palestine* 1. Paris: Gabalda.
- Aberbach, M 1950-1951. The historical allusions of chapters 4, 11 and 13 of the Psalms of Solomon. *JQR* 41, 379-396.
- Amsler, S 1963. *David Roi et Messie*. Neuchâtel: Delachaux.
- Baars, W 1961a. An additional fragment of the Syriac version of the Psalms of Solomon. *VT* 11, 222-223.
- Baars, W 1961b. A new fragment of the Greek version of the Psalms of Solomon. *VT* 11, 441-444.
- Bauer, W 1933. *Die Oden Solomons*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Beek, M A 1950. *Inleiding in de Joodse apocalypiek van het Oud- en Nieuw-Testamentisch tijdvak*. Haarlem: Bohn.
- Begrich, J 1939. Der Text der psalmen Salomos. *ZNW* 38, 131-164.
- Braun, H 1950-1951. Vom Erbarmen Gottes über den Gerechten. Zur Theologie der Psalmen Salomos. *ZNW* 43, 1-50.
- Charlesworth, J H 1981. *The Pseudepigrapha and modern research with a supplement*. Chico: Scholars Press. (SBLSCS).
- Chevallier, M A 1958. *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 11-17.
- De Boer, P A H 1958. *De Zoon van God in het Oude Testament*. Leiden: Universitaire Pers.
- De Jonge, M (ed). 1985. *Outside the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doeve, J W 1962. Parousieverzögerung. *NTT* 17, 32-38.
- Eissfeldt, O 1964. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr, 830-831.
- Foerster, W 1965. S v TWB 3, 1049-1050.

- Gray, G B 1913. The Psalms of Solomon, in R H Charles, *The apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Vol 2. Oxford: CLarendon.
- Grelot, P 1962. Le Messie dans les Apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament, in *La Venue du Messie*. Bruges: De Brouwer, 19-50. (Recherches Bibliques 6.)
- Gry, L 1906. Le Messie des Psaumes de Salomon. *Le Muséon* N S 7, 230-248
- Hahn, F. 1963. *Christologische Hoheitstitel*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.
- Hann, R R 1982. *The manuscript history of the Psalms of Solomon*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Hann, R R 1985. Christos Kyrios in PsSol 17:32. "The Lord's Anointed" reconsidered. *NTS* 31, 620-627.
- Harris, R & Mingana, A 1916-1920. *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon 1-11*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hengel, M 1961. *Die Zeloten*. Leiden: Brill.
- Holm-Nielsen, S 1960. The importance of late Jewish Psalmody for the understanding of Old Testament Psalmic tradition. *Studia theologica* 14, 1-53.
- Klausner, J 1956. *The messianic idea in Israel*. (Tr from the third Hebrew edition by W F Stinespring). London: Macmillan.
- Kuhn, K G 1937. *Die älteste Textgestalt der Psalmen Salomos*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. (BWANT 4, 21.)
- Lagrange, J 1931. *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*. Paris: Gabalda.
- Lohse, E 1964. *Die Texte aus Qumran*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Ludin Jansen, H 1937. *Die spätjüdische Psalmendichtung, ihr Entstehungskreis und ihr "Sitz im Leben"*. Oslo: Norske Videnskap-Akademie.
- Maier, J 1960. *Die Texte vom toten Meer*. München: Reinhardt, 62-63.
- Manson, T W 1945. Miscellanea apocalyptica 1. *JTS* 66, 41f.
- Manson, T W 1953. *The Servant-Messiah*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Messel, N 1915. *Die Einheitlichkeit der Jüdischen Eschatologie*. Giessen: Töpelmann.
- Meyer, R 1957. Die messianischen Propheten. *TWB* 6, 826f.

- Mowinckel, S. 1956. *He that cometh* (tr by G W Anderson). Oxford: Blackwell.
- O'Dell, J. 1961. The religious background of the Psalms of Solomon (re-evaluated in the light of the Qumran Texts). *RQ* 10, 241-257.
- Perles, F. 1902. Zur Erklärung der Psalmen Salomos. *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 5, col 269-282.
- Pesch, W. 1955. Die Abhängigkeit des 11. solomonischen Psalms vom letzten Kapitel des Buches Baruch. *ZAW* 67, 251-263.
- Plöger, O. 1959. *Theokratie und Eschatologie*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Ringgren, H. 1956. *The Messiah in the Old Testament*. London: SCM.
- Rössler, D. 1960. *Gesetz und Geschichte*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Russell, D S. 1964. *The method and message of Jewish apocalyptic*. London: SCM.
- Ryle, H E & James, M R. 1891. $\Psi\Lambda\Lambda\text{MOI}\Sigma\text{O}\Lambda\text{OM}\Omega\text{NTOS}$. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 147-148.
- Sanders, J A. 1964. Two noncanonical Psalms in 11 Q Psa. *ZAW* 76, 57-75.
- Schubert, K. 1964. Die Entwicklung der eschatologischen Naherwartung im Frühjudentum, in *Vom Messias zum Christus*. Vienna: Herder.
- Schüpphaus, J. 1977. *Die Psalmen Salomos. Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts*. Leiden: Brill. (ALGHJ 7.)
- Schürer, E. 1909. *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* 3. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Schürer, E, Vermes, G, Millar, F & Goodman, M. 1986. *The history of the Jewish people in the age of Jesus Christ (175 BC - AD 135)*. Vol 3.1 Edinburgh: Clark.
- Sevenster, G. 1962. *De verwachting van een nabij Koninkrijk in het Nieuwe Testament*. (Rectorale oratie). Leiden: Universitaire Pers.
- Trafton, J L. 1985. *The Syriac version of the Psalms of Solomon. A critical evaluation*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Van Aniel, C P. 1955. *De structuur van de Henoch-traditie en het Nieuwe Testament*. Utrecht: Kemink.

- Van der Woude, A S 1957a. *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Van der Woude, A S 1957b. *De Dankpsalmen*. Amsterdam: Brandt, 7-15.
- Van der Woude, A S 1964. 'Messiah', in *Biblisch-Historisches Handwörterbuch* 2, 1197-1204,
- Van der Woude, A S 1965. Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midrashim aus Qumran Höhle XI. *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 14, Leiden: Brill, 354-373.
- Viteau, J 1911. *Les Psaumes de Salomon*. Paris: Letourzy.
- Volz, P. 1934. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Von Rad, G. 1957-1960. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Vol 1-2. München: Kaiser.
- Vriezen, Th C. 1954. *Hoofddlijnen der Theologie van het Oude Testament*. Wageningen: Veenman.
- Wilder, A N 1958-1959. Eschatological imagery and earthly circumstance. *NTS* 5, 229-245.
- Wolfson, H A 1946-1947. Notes on Proverbs 22:10 and Psalms of Solomon 17:48. *JQR* 37, 87.
- Wright, R B. 1988. Review of Trafton (1985). *JBL* 107, 131-134.

II

THE ROLE OF INTERMEDIARIES IN GOD'S FINAL INTERVENTION IN THE FUTURE ACCORDING TO THE QUMRAN SCROLLS

The facts with which this paper deals are well-known, and have been studied by many scholars. The present author does not claim to be a Qumran specialist, and for the detailed analysis of the various passages he relies upon the exegesis of others. The question raised in this paper are primarily, though not exclusively, methodological ones; it seems to me that they will repay investigation, because the results thereby achieved may prove valid in the study of the expectations upheld in other groups among the Jewish people during the Era of the Second Temple and in later times.

The study of Jewish expectations concerning the future is greatly hampered by a lack of agreement in terminology; I prefer to use terms which are as neutral as possible in order to eliminate, as far as I can, the danger of allowing the conclusions which I reach to be influenced by the terminology which I employ. For this reason I shall avoid the terms 'messianic' and 'eschatological' and propose to use the words (admittedly all too vague) 'hope' and 'expectation'. The basic factor in those expectations which are commonly called eschatological is the conviction that God will complete and crown His dealings with His people and with the whole world by effecting a radical and lasting change, this denoting the beginning of a new era in His abiding care for His creation.¹

On the subject of the expectation of a Messiah or Messiahs in the scrolls of Qumran in particular much has been written and many different conclusions have been reached. The differences are, to a large extent, due to the fact that so many authors have failed to recognize

¹ See L. Stefaniak, 'Messianische oder eschatologische Erwartungen in der Qumransekte?', *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze. Festschrift für Prof. Joseph Schmid*, 1963, pp. 294-302 and M. de Jonge, 'The use of the word 'Anointed' in the time of Jesus', *Nov. Test.* 8, 1966, pp. 132-148.

the problem of terminology involved. As long ago as 1955, in the course of a discussion of 1QS, IX, 10-11 L. H. Silberman remarked: 'One of the most potent factors in preventing a just estimate of our purpose is the tendentious practice of capitalizing certain key words in our translation and thinking... Closely connected with this tendency is that of translating by not translating, *i.e.* using a word that has been naturalised as a technical term into English or other western tongues as a translation of its source in Hebrew where the same technical meaning may not be present.² From this it may be concluded that great caution is advisable; משיח should simply be translated 'anointed one' and any implication of a technical use of the term should be avoided. In order to avoid either prejudicing the results of one's inquiry, or blurring possible points of difference or agreement between notions found in Qumran and similar concepts found among other Jewish groups and in early Christianity, one should not prefix the definite article to the word משיח even in one's thought. It is for these reasons that in the title to this article the neutral word 'intermediary' has been preferred to the more or less technical terms which are commonly used.

THE PROPHETS OF THE PAST AND THE PROPHETS OF THE FUTURE

In CD, II, 12 the prophets anointed with (God's) Holy Spirit are called משיחו רוח קדש; they are the חזי אמת and are God's instruments. In CD, V, 21-VI, 1 Moses and the 'holy anointed ones' are mentioned as men through whom God gave his commandments, and according to 1QM, XI, 7f. God has proclaimed 'the times for the wars of his hands' through his 'anointed ones', the חזי תעודות. It is clear that it is the prophets of the past who are meant here, those who are sent by God in order to reveal His will.³ A newly discovered text 11QM^{elch}, 18 links up with the three passages just mentioned, but uses the word משיח with reference to a single prophet to be expected in the future. If Van der Woude's reconstruction is right (and I think it is) the מבשר, 'he that bringeth good tidings', mentioned in Is. LII, 7 (*cf.* LXI, 1: לבשר) is called משיח הרוח, an expression obviously inspired by Is.

² 'The two Messiahs of the Manual of Discipline', *Vet. Test.* 5, 1955, pp. 77-82 (quotation from p. 79). Cf. M. Smith, 'What is implied by the variety of messianic figures?', *J.B.L.* 78, 1959, pp. 66-72.

³ See A. S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*, 1957, pp. 15-18, 25-27, 123-124 and M. de Jonge, *op.cit.*, p. 141.

LXI,1: רוח אדני יהוה עלי יען משח יהוה אתי לבשר.⁴ The good tidings are concerned with God's intervention in history through Melchizedek, who destroys Belial and his spirits. It is clear that we should translate הרוח משיח by 'he that is anointed by the Spirit' and avoid 'Messiah' as a technical term.

It is quite possible that this משיח הרוח is the same figure as the נביא mentioned in 1QS, IX, 11, together with the משיחי אהרן וישראל. In 1QS, IX, 11 the status of the prophet as anointed is not stressed, whereas the two figures whom he accompanies are called 'anointed ones'. It should also be remarked, that 4Qtest quotes Deut. XVIII, 18-19 before Num. XXIV, 15-17 and Deut. XXXIII, 8-11, and that the question of anointing does not arise in any of these prooftexts. This divergence in the use of the term 'anointed one' in connection with a prophet expected in the future (as well as with the prophets of the past)⁵ makes us wonder whether, in the case of the prophet who was anointed, the anointing was really regarded as of primary importance. In 11QMelch, 18, at any rate, this designation was inspired by the texts from Scripture which influenced the author's views on the future.

THE HIGH PRIEST

When we turn our attention to the passages which mention a high priest in the future a similar picture emerges. In the well-known section 1QSa, II, 11-22 the royal figure of the future is twice called משיח ישראל (ll. 14, 20) and (perhaps) once המשיח without further qualification or addition (l. 12).⁶ The (high) priest, on the other hand, is simply called הכהן (l. 19). The text and interpretation of l. 12 are not quite certain, but Maier's translation, *der Priester, das Haupt der ganzen Gemeinde Israels*⁷ has much to commend it. In other texts also a priest is mentioned side by side with a prince. Attention has already been drawn to 4Qtest. In 4QpIs^a, fragment D, 7, which gives a commentary on Is. XI, 3, we are told that the descendant of

⁴ See M. de Jonge and A. S. van der Woude, '11QMelchizedek and the New Testament', *N.T.St.* 12, 1965-66, pp. 301-326, esp. p. 306.

⁵ The prophets of the past are often called 'God's servants' (e.g. 1QpH, II, 9; VII, 5; 1QS, I, 3; 4QpHos^b, II, 5; 4QDibHam, III, 13); cf. also the expression גלו הנביאים ברוח קודש in 1QS, VIII, 16.

⁶ On this text see Van der Woude, *Mess. Vorst.*, p. 99 and J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, 2 vols. 1960, esp. II, pp. 158f.

⁷ *Op.cit.*, I, p. 175; cf. II, p. 159.

David who will appear in the future will judge according to the teaching of the priests. This links up with 4Qflor,11 where *one* figure, the *דורש התורה* appears at the side of the Scion of David, obviously with the same task as the priests just mentioned. In the War-Scroll the prince of the congregation is a comparatively unimportant person; he is mentioned only in 1QM, V, 1, where the *מגן* (shield) of the *נשיא כול העדה* is described. He remains somewhat in the shadow of the *כוהן הראש* who is mentioned in II,1; XV,4; XVI,13; XVIII,5 and XIX, 11.⁸ This priest transmits God's directives for the war and recites the prayers which have to be recited; he strengthens the hearts of those who have been severely oppressed and thanks God for His help in the final battle against evil.⁹

Nowhere is the (high) priest of God's future called *משיח* except in 1QS, IX, 11, which mentions the arrival of a (or the) prophet and of the *משיחי אהרן וישראל*. This is, at least, the only certain instance. Much has been written on the problem of the similar expression *משיח וישראל* in CD, XII 23f.; XIV, 19; XIX, 10f.; cf. XX, 1; *משיח מאהרן וישראל*. We may refer here to a recent article by R. Deichgräber.¹⁰ Having given a survey of recent opinion on the subject, this author comes to the conclusion that the reading *משיח* which is certainly correct from the aspect of text-criticism, nevertheless admits of a plural interpretation. Consequently there is no need to suppose that the conceptions concerning the persons to be expected in the future ordained by God have been altered.¹¹ On the main problem, which is one of Hebrew syntax, I do not feel competent to give a decision here. While it seems to me rash to build theories as to the development of the expectations in Qumran on the basis of these equivocal passages from CD, I should like to remark that a singular interpretation is *a priori* more likely. I shall return to this presently. In any case it re-

⁸ He probably was also mentioned at the end of the last line of col. XII – see Van der Woude, *Mess. Vorst.*, p. 126. See also his remarks on the connections between the priest mentioned in 1QM, XV, 6 *etc.* and the priest anointed for war, mentioned in the *Mishnah* (pp. 128f.).

⁹ In 1QM, IX, 8 we read that all priests should keep themselves holy during the battle and avoid pollution because of *משיחת כהונתם*.

¹⁰ 'Zur Messiaserwartung der Damaskusschrift', *Z.A.W.* 78, 1966, pp. 333-343.

¹¹ Among those who support Deichgräber's interpretation are Van der Woude, *Mess. Vorst.*, pp. 29; 66; 74 and R. E. Brown, 'J. Starcky's theory of Qumran messianic development', *C.B.Q.* 28, 1966, pp. 51-57. G. R. Driver, *The Judean Scrolls, a Problem and Solution*, 1965, pp. 468f. criticizes it, on philological as well as on other grounds.

mains to be seen whether the members of the Qumran-sect were so particular about the use of the term משיח as some modern scholars think should have been. The sect does not seem to have emphasized the anointed state of the high priest in the future ordained by God. Yet the role played by this priest as leader of the future Israel is a fairly important one. In many ways he is a more important figure than the prince who is awaited.¹² In fact the designation נשיא instead of מלך for the latter suggests that the conception of *Ezekiel*, XL-XLVIII and related passages has exercised some influence. The Qumran-sect was a group under priestly leadership; the priests studied the law and interpreted it. It was self-evident that in the future ordained by God an ideal and divinely appointed high priest should come, one who was anointed according to the rule laid down in *Exod.* XXIX,7; *Levit.* VIII,12.¹³ It was of the highest importance that this high priest of the seed of Aaron was to be the true one, duly chosen and appointed; but the fact that he would be duly *anointed* obviously needed no special emphasis.

J. Liver¹⁴ has drawn attention to the well-known fact that according to rabbinic tradition during the reign of Josiah the oil of unction was hidden away, and at the time of the Second Commonwealth there was none. A distinction was made between the כהן המשיח, *i.e.* המשיח המרובה בבגדים, 'he that is distinguished by a larger number of official garments' (*M.Hor.* II,4).¹⁵ The *Mishnah* tends to minimize the differences between the two, but certain differences do remain. Liver concludes: 'In Mishnaic law, only the anointed high priest has full authority, but in view of the absence of the oil of unction there can only be an anointed high priest at the end of the days.'¹⁶ In this respect the views of the sectarians agree with those of other and later groups in Judaism. Probably they felt the need for a proper reinstatement of the original prescriptions concerning the high priesthood even more strongly than did the Pharisees and the later rabbis responsible for the opinions laid down in the *Mishnah*, because they

¹² See 1QS_a; 1QS_b (the highpriest and the priest are blessed before the prince); 1QS and CD (Aaron regularly mentioned before Israel); 1QM, *passim*; 4QpIs^a (the priests as advisors).

¹³ Cf. *Levit.* IV,3.5.16 and *Exod.* XXVIII, 41.

¹⁴ In his 'The doctrine of the two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth', *H.Th.R.* 52, 1959, pp. 149-185, esp. pp. 152f.

¹⁵ The translation is that of Ph. Blackman, *Mishnayoth*, IV, 1963², p. 571.

¹⁶ *Op.cit.* p. 153.

were so violently opposed to the conditions prevailing in the temple in Jerusalem at that time, and could not possibly accept the authority of the official 'high priest-with-the-many-garments'. Nevertheless they do not seem to have pressed the point with regard to the anointing.

THE PRINCE

The word משיח is also used with reference to the future king from David's seed, or rather – to conform to Qumran terminology – with reference to the prince, the נשיא העדה.¹⁷ 4*Qpatr*,3 announces the coming of a משיח הצדק, who is also called צמח דוד (cf. *Jer.* XXIII,5; XXXIII,15f.). The latter expression is also used in 4*Qflor*,11, where the Scion of David is to be accompanied by a דורש התורה. Prophecies concerning David and his descendants have played an important part. This is also clear in 1*QSa*,V,20ff., which gives the blessing for the 'prince of the congregation', and in 4*QpIs^a*, C and D; the general tendency, is however to regard the prince as subordinate to the priest (see the examples mentioned above in connection with the high priest). He is not automatically called משיח; in fact the only case where the word is (possibly) used absolutely is the uncertain and much disputed passage 1*QSa*,II,11f.: אִם יוֹלִיד אֶל אֶת הַמְּשִׁיחַ אֲתָם.¹⁸ The 4*Qpatr*,3 – passage comes near to such an absolute use of the term, but in all the other instances משיח is determined by a following ישראֵל (mostly in the combination ישראֵל וישראל אהרן).

Nevertheless there is a tendency among scholars to regard the prince as *the* Messiah. R. B. Laurin¹⁹ calls him *the* Messiah, while according to his views the accompanying figure of the high priest should be called only 'an anointed one'.²⁰ Laurin finds only *one* Messiah in *CD*, and assumes that in 1*QS*,IX,11 משיחים is used with the general meaning of 'the anointed ones'. Of course, if we leave aside the controversial expressions in *CD*, 1*QS*,IX,11 is the only instance where the high priest is called 'the anointed one'²¹; but it is precisely this text

¹⁷ In *CD*,V,1 f., the term נשיא is used in connection with David.

¹⁸ See Van der Woude and Maier in n. 6 above.

¹⁹ 'The Problem of the two Messiahs in the Qumran Scrolls', *R.d.Q.* IV,1 (no 13), 1963, pp. 39-52.

²⁰ For a similar view see C. T. Fritsch, 'The so-called Priestly Messiah of the Essenes', *J.E.O.L.* 17, 1963, pp. 242-248 and now also A. J. B. Higgins, 'The Priestly Messiah', *N.T.St.* 13, 1966-67, pp. 211-239.

²¹ Cf., however, 1*QM*,IX,8.

which should lead us to question the correctness of the translation 'Messiah' in the case of the משיח ישראל too. In the Qumran-texts it is possible, but not necessary for the highpriest to be termed 'the anointed one', just as it is possible but not essential for that expression to be used of the expected king (prince). The important element in the expectation of the sect is the conviction that God will show his loving care for (the faithful remnant in) Israel by renewing the kingship; משיח denotes divine calling and appointment and cannot properly be called a title, though there may have been a special tendency to use it as a standard expression for the future king.²²

Objections against this view have recently been raised by J. A. Fitzmyer.²³ This author realizes that the use of the term משיח was very much more diversified than would appear from later Jewish and Christian usage, but regards it as a hypercritical tendency to speak of 'Anointed Ones' (like Silberman and M. Smith)²⁴ or 'consacrés' (like J. Carmignac)²⁵. Thus he says: 'For it is precisely these texts which show that the genuine OT theme of an Anointed One had definitely developed in the expectation of a Messiah (or Messiahs)'.²⁶ Against this it should be remarked that what makes the king, prophet and priest of the future unique is not the terminology which is used to designate them, but the role assigned to them in God's dealings with His people and the world. In treating of the name and the personality of the Messiah in the period of the *Tannaim* Joseph Klausner once said²⁷ that for the *Tannaim*, just as for the prophets, the essential factor is not the Messiah, but the messianic age. The Messiah was only the instrument of God, albeit the most favoured and glorious instrument that would ever take bodily form on earth. The same applies to the Qumran-texts known to us. They too expect a number of figures sent by God, to none of whom the designation 'anointed one' belongs exclusively. It is not the persons as such that are important, but their calling and function, because it is through them that God shows his continuing

²² The last two sentences have been taken from M. de Jonge, *Nov. Test.* 8, p. 140.

²³ In his article 'The Aramic 'Elect of God' Text from Qumran Cave IV', *C.B.Q.* 27, 1965, pp. 348-372, esp. pp. 355f.

²⁴ In their publications mentioned in n. 2.

²⁵ In *Les textes de Qumran*, II, 1963, p. 13, cf. also P. Guilbert in vol. I, 1961, p. 63.

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 356.

²⁷ In his *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, transl. W. F. Stinespring, 1955, p. 469. Cf. E. Lohse, 'Der König aus Davids Geschlecht, Bemerkungen zur messianischen Erwartung der Synagoge', in *Abraham unser Vater, Festschrift für O. Michel*, 1963, pp. 337-345.

care and his power to overcome all opposition. The central point is that God will bring about a change in the history of his people and that thenceforward, Israel will have a true prince and/or a true high priest or prophet.

THE FUNCTION(S) OF THE INTERMEDIARIES

What is (are) the function(s) of the persons who are expected? Here we find the same divergence of views as is found with regard to the terminology. *4Qpatr*, *4Qflor*, *4QpIs^a*, and *1QSb* describe the king as a warrior who will destroy the forces of evil. But *4Qflor*, 11 assigns him a **דורש התורה** at his side and *4QpIs^a*, D, 7 makes him listen to the teaching of the priests. Quite unlike the anointed Son of David in *PsSal*, 17, who is a wise teacher as well as a mighty ruler, this prince has to be guided by priests (scribes) experienced in the interpretation of the law.²⁸ It is the priest therefore, who presides at the meal described in *1QSa*, and for the same reason in the *War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* the role of the prince remains a shadowy one. In the latter document it is the high priest who gives the necessary commandments and the victory is won through the help of the Holy Ones sent from Heaven. There is a connection with *11QMelch* where God's vengeance is wrought through the heavenly Melchizedek; it is Melchizedek's victory which is announced by the **משיח הרוח**. In *11QMelch*, in *1QM*, and in *1QS*, III, 13-IV, 26 all emphasis is laid upon the superhuman struggle between God with his angels on the one hand and Belial with his evil spirits on the other. In *11QMelch* the angelic Melchizedek occupies the centre of the picture. In *1QM*, XII, 9f. the **גבור** is either God himself or the prince of angels.²⁹ Likewise the section on the Two Spirits in *1QS* tells us that **אל ישראל ומלאך אמתו** will help all the children of light against the temptations of Belial

²⁸ This is all the more striking because the intention in this passage is to provide an interpretation of *Is.* XI, 1-4a, in which God's spirit, wisdom and knowledge are promised for the expected Son of David. The prince's dependence on the priests is 'proved' by a special interpretation of **ולא-למשמע אוניו יוכיח**.

²⁹ See Van der Woude, *Mess. Vorst.*, pp. 135-140. Cf. his 'Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI', *Oudtestamentische Studien*, XIV, 1965, pp. 354-373, esp. p. 369, where he points to the part played by Michael (or the chief angel) in *1QM* IX, 15; XIII, 9f.; XVII, 5-9; *1QS*, III, 20, 24 and *CD*, V, 18. For another interpretation see a.o. M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 1961, pp. 154-156.

and his spirits until the final battle against the hosts of evil is won (1QS, III, 24; IV, 20ff.). In this conception the **נשיא** virtually disappears and the **כהן הראש**, though still important in 1QM as mediator between God and his people, remains a secondary figure.³⁰ This conception differs considerably from that underlying the passages in which the future prince plays an important part. It may be possible to find an explanation for these divergencies in some differences in the circumstances in which the various documents were written. Unfortunately, the historical reconstruction of the background of the various writings will always remain very hazardous, so that it is difficult to speak with certainty on this point. We can say with greater confidence that the divergent pictures of the future, and of the prince's role in that future have been influenced by differences in the relevant passages from Scripture. Joseph Klausner's statement 'The later messianic expectations have two main sources: *decisive historical events* and *Holy Scripture*'³¹ clearly applies also to the texts of Qumran. We should not try to harmonize the various conceptions, but conclude rather, that with regard to the traditional conceptions contained in these portrayals of the future they may differ according to their initial points of inspiration in Scripture, while the differences in traditional, contemporary ways of thought apparent in them may be due to differences in the events which have influenced them. Thinking about the future always implies the use of images, 'mythical language', and this thinking is not exclusive, but inclusive.³² One of the striking points in Jewish apocalyptic documents is the variety of images even within a single writing, or within a single vision belonging to a writing which contains many visions. These images are meant to be complementary rather than mutually exclusive. An analysis of the various conceptions and their literary relationships may help us to classify them, but I doubt whether it brings us any nearer to the minds of those who, in apocalyptic language or in other terminology, think, dream and prophesy concerning God's future.

This means that we should be very cautious in our attempts to detect a development within the 'messianism' of Qumran. Such a

³⁰ See especially K. Weiss, 'Messianismus in Qumran und im Neuen Testament', in *Qumran-Probleme*, ed. H. Bardtke, 1963, pp. 353-368.

³¹ *Op.cit.*, p. 384.

³² See on this subject A. N. Wilder, 'Eschatological Imagery and Earthly Circumstance', *N.T.St.* 5, 1958-59, pp. 229-245 and his book *Early Christian Rhetorics*, 1964, esp. pp. 126-136.

development cannot be denied *a priori*, but we should bear in mind that variations do not necessarily imply development. At this point I do not propose to give an analysis of J. Starcky's well-known article on 'Les quatre étapes du Messianisme à Qumran'.³³ This would entail the discussion of a number of technical details, which I leave to specialists in the field.³⁴ In the context of this paper I should merely like to remark that we should put less emphasis than Starcky on the differences in the use of the word משיח, and assign a greater role than Starcky allows for to the influence of Scripture (and of various traditions within Scripture) upon thinking about the future. Starcky's theories concerning the reactions of the Qumran-sect to the political developments and crises which took place in the course of its existence remain necessarily hypothetical; arguments of this kind should be used with great caution.³⁵

דורש התורה AND THE יורה הצדק

Let us return, however, to the actual texts, especially to those which treat of the expectations relating to a future high priest and a prophet. We should connect these with that other group of passages in which the advent of a יורה הצדק and a דורש התורה is awaited. Here we should bear in mind especially that no matter how final and decisive the imminent intervention of God is expected to be, the future is always conceived of within the framework of God's dealings with his people and with the world in the past, the present and the future. As K. Weiss has pointed out, the present and the past are mirrored in the future: 'All das wird mehr oder weniger in das Bild der messianischen Zeit hineingespiegelt, so dass heilsgeschichtliche Vergangenheit des Volkes, Heilsgegenwart der Sekte und messianische Zukunft ganz ineinander liegen und auf einer Ebene gesehen werden. So erklärt sich wohl auch die Tatsache, dass über Gestalten der Vergangenheit und Gegenwart einerseits und über erwartete messianische Personen an-

³³ *R.B.* 70, 1963, pp. 481-505.

³⁴ For a criticism see J. Fitzmyer and R. E. Brown in their articles mentioned above.

³⁵ See also M. Smith, *op.cit.*, pp. 71 f.: 'If the variety of eschatological prediction is any evidence, eschatology was, for the members of those groups, a comparatively arbitrary and individual matter – part and an important part, of their *Weltanschauung*, but a part about which the opinions of different members might, and did, differ quite widely.'

drerseits gleichartige, ja identische Aussagen gemacht werden können'.³⁶

The main texts are *CD*, VI, 11 and VII, 18, which according to Van der Woude³⁷, whose interpretation I follow, show that the expressions **יורה הצדק** (or **מורה**) and **דורש התורה** may be used to denote not only a person in past history³⁸, but also one whose future advent is still awaited.³⁹ It is not in the least likely that the sect expected the return or resurrection of the person of the past in the future⁴⁰, but it evidently thought of the future in terms connected with the past.

This raises the question of whether this teacher and interpreter of the Law is to be identified with either the prophet or the priest. The manner in which the subject of the advent of these figures is introduced makes it probable that he is so identified with them.

According to *CD*, VI, 10f. the sect has to follow the regulations laid down by the historical **דורש התורה** during the entire period of evil; they will not accept any other teaching: **עד עמוד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים**. This terminology agrees with that found in:

CD, XII, 23f.: **עד עמוד משיח אהרן וישראל**

CD, XX, 1⁴¹: **עד עמוד משיח מאהרן ומישראל**

CD, XIX, 10f.: **בבוא משיח אהרן**

1*QS*, IX, 11: **עד בוא נביא ומשיחי אהרן וישראל**

This agreement is not restricted to the terminology alone, but extends to the context also. In *CD*, XII, 23f. the **סרך מושב** for the camps applies for the **קץ הרשעה** until the appearance of the anointed one(s) from Aaron and Israel⁴²; in *CD*, XIX, 35-XX, 1 the present is described as the period between the 'being-gathered-in' of the **מורה היחיד** and the advent of the anointed one(s) of Aaron and Israel, and according to 1*QS*, IX, 10f. the **משפטים הרשונים** will remain in force until the

³⁶ *Op.cit.*, p. 337. By 'all das' Weiss refers to ... 'die Zeitereignisse und deren Daten und Personen, die geistlichen Erfahrungen der Sekte... ihre Ordnung und Verfassung ... die in ihr gepflegten priesterlichen Traditionen und die in ihr wirkenden Persönlichkeiten.'

³⁷ See his *Mess. Vorst.*, pp. 54f., 67-74, esp. p. 74.

³⁸ *CD*, I, 11; VI, 7; cf. the general expression **איש דורש התורה** in 1*QS*, VI, 6; VIII, 11f.

³⁹ *CD*, VI, 11; VII, 18.

⁴⁰ See Van der Woude, *loc.cit.* and J. Maier, *op.cit.* II, pp. 50f., 53.

⁴¹ Cf. also *CD*, XIV, 18f. according to the most plausible reconstruction of the text – see Van der Woude, *Mess. Vorst.*, p. 30 and E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran*, Darmstadt 1964, *in loc.*

⁴² Cf. again *CD*, XIV, 17ff., very likely to be reconstructed in accordance with *CD*, XII, 23f.

prophet and the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel come. The terminology seems to have become stereotyped, but one thing is clear: One of the characteristics of God's future intervention will be new teaching and a new interpretation of the Law. This will mark a new era in Israel's understanding of the *Torah*, on the analogy of that new understanding which was brought about by the historical Teacher of Righteousness as a result of his study of the *Torah*.

According to CD, VII, 18 the *דורש התורה* will be the companion of the *נשיא כל העדה*, and this connects harmoniously with 4QFlor, 11 and in the second instance with 4QpIs^a, D, 7 mentioned above.⁴³ Is it therefore, legitimate to conclude that the expected Teacher (Searcher of the Law) is the same as the high priest of the future? This is the conclusion reached by Van der Woude. I do not think, however, that as a theory it can be accepted without qualification. If we look back to the sectarians' views on the past we find that one of the principal tasks of the *נביאים* was to endorse and to expound what Moses had said.⁴⁴ See 1QS, I, 3; VIII, 15f. (in connection with *מדורש התורה*); CD, V, 21-VI, 1; VII, 15-18. But we also read that the prophets proclaim what God's future dealings with his people will be. 1QpHab, II, 9f. speaks of the *דברי עבדיו הנביאים* [אשר בידם ספר אל את כול הבאות על עמו והארצו] and 1QpHab, VII, 1 tells us that God ordered Habakuk to write down what would come *על הדור האחרון*. The words of the prophets, no less than the *Torah* which was given through Moses and through them, need interpretation. This interpretation has been given by the *דברי עבדיו הנביאים* מורה הצדק אשר הודיעו אל את כול רוי דברי עבדיו הנביאים (cf. l. 8). This Teacher knew more than Habakuk himself, of whom pHab tells us: *ואת גמר הקץ לוא הודעו* (cf. 1QpHab, II, 8). The Teacher of Righteousness gave a new interpretation of the *Torah* and he explained the words of the prophets; the sect follows his interpretation and explanation 'bis auf bessere Belehrung', i.e. until yet a further stage is reached in God's dealings with Israel. This will be the final one, and will be marked by the arrival of a new prophet (like Moses, Deut. XVIII, 18f.; 4Qtest, 5-8), who will explain everything which still needs to be explained. This view agrees with the well-known passages in 1Macc. IV, 46; XIV, 41, which tell us that certain measures which are being taken

⁴³ 4QpPs37, III, 15 speaks of *הכוהן מורה הצדק*, denoting a figure of the past; cf. II, 19. In 1Q, 29, 5, 2 we read *יִדְרֹשׁ הַכֹּהֵן לְכוּל רִצּוֹנוֹ*. Does this refer to one priest or does it lay down a general rule? In any case this text proves that priests were expected to study the law and comment upon it.

⁴⁴ See on this subject also L. Stefaniak, *op.cit.*, pp. 297-299.

are only provisional, and are to be in force only until the arrival of a prophet who can give guidance as to what should finally be decided.⁴⁵ These considerations would suggest that the expected **דורש התורה**/**יורה הצדק** is thought of as identical with the prophet spoken of in certain texts. On the other hand in *1QpHab*, II, 8 the historical Teacher of Righteousness is called **הכוהן** precisely in connection with his function of explaining the words of the prophets. And this tells in favour of Van der Woude's identification of the **יורה הצדק** with the awaited high priest. I suggest that we can arrive at the true solution to the problem, if we take into account the flexibility of the conceptions and bear in mind that it was not the persons but their functions that were important. The historical Teacher of Righteousness was seen as standing in the tradition of Moses and the prophets; he was the true interpreter of their words, the true prophet, scribe and priest, symbol of all that the sect stood for. What he had done would be done again, and this time once and for all, after God's final intervention in the history of Israel and mankind. Sometimes a prophet is mentioned as well as a priest (*4Qtest*, 5-8; *1QS*, IX, 11); sometimes the priest's (or rather priests') duty to expound the *Torah* is emphasized (*4QpIs^a*, D, 7 (plural), *4Qtest*, 17-18 (the sons of Levi)); sometimes the high priest receives a simple mention without any emphasis on his new teaching function (*1QSa*, II, 11 ff., and *1QM* to a certain extent); sometimes it is only the coming of one who will teach and explain that is announced (*CD*, VI, 11; VII, 18; *4Qflor*, 11) without any further specification.⁴⁶ I do not think that we should try to systematize more than the documents themselves. The functions of the figures involved, in as much as it is through them that God guides and helps His people, are of far greater importance than the actual persons and their designations.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ See also the well-balanced presentation of the evidence in W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, 1964, pp. 139-156.

⁴⁶ See also G. R. Driver, *op.cit.*, pp. 477-484.

⁴⁷ We should note, in passing, *4QAhA*, mentioned by J. Starcky, *op.cit.* p. 492. The contents of the longest fragment of this text he describes as follows: 'Dans le fragment le plus étendu, Jacob(?) dévoile à Lévi une figure eschatologique qui est certainement le grand prêtre de l'ère messianique...'; his conclusion is: 'Pour notre auteur comme pour celui de la *Règle de la Congrégation*, le messie d'Aaron sera le messie principal.' In *op.cit.*, pp. 497 f. Starcky draws attention to *4QarP*. One line seems to mention Elijah; the preceding one uses the word **בִּחֵיר** in connection with an unknown person. Fragments like these remind us of the fragmentary state of our evidence and serve as a

ONE OR TWO 'ANOINTED ONES' IN CD?

This is the appropriate point at which to return to the expression משיח אהרן וישראל in *CD*. How is *CD*, XII, 23f. (with XIV, 17f. as a probable parallel)⁴⁸ to be explained? It is possible that the author(s) of *CD* wanted only to indicate a time-limit, but in view of *CD*, VI, 10f. and 1QS, IX, 10f. it is more likely that the teaching function of one who is to come is also implied. Those who accept the theory that *CD* announces the coming of two separate persons will have to ask whether the teaching function is ascribed to the משיח אהרן or to both anointed ones together. The latter alternative is very improbable in view of the parallels; the former makes us ask why in that case the משיח ישראל is mentioned at all. For this reason I am inclined to give my support to those who hold that משיח אהרן וישראל refers to one and the same person. This single 'anointed one' embodies the functions of prophet, priest and prince. In view of the diversification of ideas which prevailed at Qumran this merging of functions in a single individual seems quite possible and legitimate. This may explain the different contexts in which the expression משיח אהרן וישראל occurs in *CD*. As has already been said the reconstruction of the text in *CD*, XIV, 17ff. is very uncertain. It seems to have been very similar to that of *CD*, XII, 23f., though a point of special importance is the addition of the phrase ויכפר עונם. Unfortunately it is not clear whether God or the משיח אהרן וישראל is the subject of the verb here.⁴⁹ If it is the משיח, then we must ask whether the use of the verb כפר does not emphasize the priestly side of this single figure. In 4Q^ahA, mentioned by Starcky, a high priest of the future is announced who 'fera l'expiation (יכפר) pour tous les fils de sa génération et il sera envoyé à tous les fils de son []'.⁵⁰ There may be some connection with the atoning activity

warning not to be too definite in the solutions we suggest. Until more is known about these texts we shall have to reserve our opinion.

In 4Q^flor, 18f. the quotation from Ps. II, 1-2 seems to have included the word משיחו. The explanation given of this word is not quite clear; there seems to be a connection with the expression בחירי ישראל which follows.

⁴⁸ See n. 41 and n. 42 above.

⁴⁹ Or is it a *pu'al*-form which is written defectively? See Van der Woude, *Mess. Vorst.*, p. 32.

⁵⁰ *Op.cit.*, p. 492. There may be a parallel here with 11Q^{Melch}, 8, where, however, the subject of לכפר cannot be determined with certainty (De Jonge and Van der Woude, *op.cit.*, pp. 306f.).

of the priestly sect itself (1QS, V, 5f; VIII, 6.9f.; IX, 3f.; 1QSa, I, 3).⁵¹

Not much can be gathered from the phrase **מיום האסף מורה היחיד עד** in *CD*, XIX, 35-XX, 1. The parallelism between the teacher and the expected anointed one(s) may suggest that a single individual is envisaged, and that it is the teaching function of this future anointed one that is being emphasized. But other interpretations remain possible.

In *CD*, XIX, 10f. the situation is different; here the **קץ המקדה** is mentioned. The **עניי הצאן** will be saved, but the others will be delivered to the sword (*Zech.* XI, 11; XIII, 7) **בבוא משיח אהרן וישראל**. This last phrase may be a stereotyped expression; it is not said that this figure wields the sword. It seems likely, however, that the one **משיח** is associated with the execution of God's vengeance, though God's initiative is emphasized throughout. If we suppose that two figures are mentioned here then one of them, the **משיח אהרן**, seems to play no part at all. To the objection that in the similar passage *CD*, VII, 9-VIII, 2 the future **דורש התורה** and **נשיא כל העדה** are mentioned side by side, we may answer that: a) in our present passage the destruction of the sons of Seth is the task of the prince, and b) the fact that in the similar passage referred to the **דורש התורה** is mentioned separately, and with a definite function of his own, does not prove that he also occurs as a distinct functionary in the passage here under consideration. *CD*, VII, 9-VIII, 2 and XIX, 5-14 belong to different recensions of *CD* and may give a different picture. Here again we should not systematize more than the texts themselves.

I QH, III

I pass over without further comment the very difficult and much disputed passage 1QH, III, 7-18⁵², which according to some scholars gives a picture of the birth of the Messiah. Notwithstanding the reference to *Is.* IX, 5 in the expression **פלא יועץ עם גבורתו** (l. 10), there does not seem to be any allusion to the birth of one particular person. We should notice transition from singular to plural in l. 11 (cf. l. 8 and perhaps also l. 7). The community of the righteous is here being set in contrast with the community of the evil ones; the former will be saved in the period of great tribulation which accompanies God's inter-

⁵¹ In all other instances where **כפר** occurs in *CD* God is the subject of the verb (cf. 1QS, II, 8; XI, 14, and III, 6, 8).

⁵² See e.g. Maier, *op.cit.* II, pp. 72f.

vention. To quote M. Black: 'The figure of birth belongs to a complex of confused and interwoven figures of speech describing the woes of Israel—a storm at sea, earthquake and upheaval on earth. The reference to the begetting of sons (בנים) makes it quite evident that it is of a *people* and not of an individual that the author is thinking. But it is clearly a people with a 'messianic' mission ('Wonderful Counselor'); and the eschatological setting of the hymn suggests that its subjects is the 'birth-pangs of the Messiah' in the sense of the emergence through trial and suffering of the redeemed Israel.'⁵³

4 QMESS AR.

Much has been written lately about 4QMess Ar., a text published recently by J. Starcky.⁵⁴ The passage which interests us is *Fragm.* 1, I, 10f., which reads: ויצליחון בשבטוהי בדי בחיר אלהא הוא מולדה ורוח נשמוהי [ח]שבטוהי להיין לעלמין. The various scholars who have commented upon it do not differ as to the correctness of the reading.⁵⁵ The main difficulty is that we do not know what should be added, and for this reason the translations of this passage differ greatly.

J. Starcky⁵⁶: [mais] ses desseins [réussiront]. Parce qu'il est l' élu de Dieu sa géniture et l'esprit de son souffle 11 [sont parfaits et] ses desseins seront pour l'éternité...

J. Fitzmyer⁵⁷: [But]his [cal]culations [will succeed] because He is the elect of God. His birth and the (very) spirit of breath 11 [] his [cal]culations will exist for ever.

J. Carmignac⁵⁸: ses [des]seins, parce que sa naissance est choisie de Dieu: le vent de son souffle 11 [] ses [des]seins existeront à perpétuité.

⁵³ *Op.cit.*, p. 150; cf. Van der Woude, *Mess.Vorst.* pp. 144-156.

⁵⁴ Cf. J. Starcky, 'Un texte messianique araméen de la grotte 4 de Qumran', in *Mémorial du Cinquantenaire de l'École des langues orientales anciennes de l'Institut Catholique de Paris*, 1964, pp. 51-66; A. Dupont-Sommer, 'Deux documents horoscopiques esséniens découverts à Qumran, près de la Mer Morte', *C.R.A.I.* 1965, pp. 239-253; J. Carmignac, 'Les Horoscopes de Qumran', *R. de Q.* V, 2, 1965, pp. 199-218, and J. Fitzmyer, in the article mentioned in n. 23.

⁵⁵ Except that Carmignac does not add ויצליחון and reads אשבטוהי with no difference in meaning.

⁵⁶ *Op.cit.* p. 54.

⁵⁷ *Op.cit.* p. 359.

⁵⁸ *Op.cit.* pp. 216f.

A. Dupont Sommer⁵⁹: [et] ses [des]seins [réussiront], parce que l'Élu de Dieu sera Son engendré et que l'esprit de Son souffle 11 [sera dans ses narines], [et] ses [des]seins subsisteront à jamais.

There are at least three main problems:

- 1) How is מולדה to be explained?
- 2) What is the meaning of the expression בחר אלהא?
- 3) What is the meaning of this passage as a whole?

The question of central importance is of course: Is there an allusion here to the birth of a human intermediary in God's final intervention, and is he called 'the Elect of God', or even 'one who is begotten by Him'?

ad 1: 4Q Mess Ar should probably be connected with the Astrological Cryptic Document from Qumran (4QCrypt) published by J. M. Allegro⁶⁰, which seems to give a sort of horoscope of various people who possess light and darkness in different proportions. This document provides a very interesting and unusual commentary on the Doctrine of the Two Spirits in 1QS, III, 13-IV, 26, indicating that metaphorical expressions like בני אור and בני חושך⁶¹ could also be connected with speculations concerning the actual birth of individuals. In II, 8 the word המולד occurs with the meaning, 'time of birth', probably, like the Greek word γένεσις having the technical signification of 'constellation of birth'. This has been established beyond doubt by M. Delcor.⁶² This makes it *a priori* probable that מולדה in 4Q Mess Ar should be translated 'his birth', and not 'his begotten one'. I should like to refer here to J. Starcky's well-balanced comment on pp. 60-61 of his article on 4Q Mess Ar, in which he draws attention to 1QSa, II, 10, (Ps. II, 4, and Ps. CX, 3, LXX), and emphasizes that the latter designation would in itself be possible in a Jewish document.⁶³ מולדה should be connected with the phrase רוח נשמוהי which follows (cf. Gen. II, 7; VII, 22; Is. LVII, 16; Job. XXXIV, 14).

ad 2: Consequently there is no connection with the expression בחר

⁵⁹ *Op.cit.* p. 248.

⁶⁰ 'An astrological cryptic document from Qumran', *J.S.S.* 9, 1964, pp. 291-294.

⁶¹ Cf. מולדי עולה in 1Q 27, I, 2.

⁶² In his 'Recherches sur un horoscope en langue hébraïque provenant de Qumran', *R. de Q.* 5, 1966, pp. 521-542. Suggestions in this direction are already found in publications of Dupont-Sommer, Starcky and Carmignac.

⁶³ See also O. Michel-O. Betz, 'Von Gott gezeugt', in *Judentum, Christentum, Urkirche*, Festschrift für J. Jeremias, *B.Z.N.W.* 26, 1960, pp. 3-23.

אלהא. The Hebrew word **בְּחִיר** occurs several times in Qumran, the plural is frequently used to denote the community of Qumran as a whole, and once it refers to heavenly beings (1QM, XII, 5). A few times the singular occurs. In 4QarP it denotes an individual (still unknown). In 4QpIs^a, 3, however, the expression **בְּחִירֵי** [עֲדָת] may be plural after all, as in 4QpPs 37, II, 5 and III, 5. The same also applies to the **בְּחִירֵי** in 1QpHab, V, 4 and IX, 12.

ad 3: Does the singular expression in our passage refer to a man chosen by God in the sense of 'a true member of the community'? Or to a very special individual, one perhaps to be born in the future at a time ordained by God, and having a special commission from God? J. Starcky remarks: 'il s'agit de l'élú de Dieu, c'est à dire du Messie'⁶⁴, and he quotes Is. XLII, 3 and LXI, 1. Against this Fitzmyer rightly remarks: 'But this identification is not at all certain. True, the word **בְּחִירִי**, 'My Elect One, my Chosen One', does occur in Is. 42, 1; yet it is used of the Servant of Yahweh, who is not without further ado a Messiah. In Is. LXI, 1 an anointed messenger is mentioned, but he is not called an Elect of God'.⁶⁵ The expression 'the Elect One' (*c.q.* 'My Elect One'), deriving from Is. XLII, 1, is however used in several passages of the parables of *Enoch*, as Starcky⁶⁶, Dupont-Sommer⁶⁷ and Fitzmyer⁶⁸ remind us.

It is clear that the answer to this problem can be found only by taking the context into account. The text speaks about birth and, like 4QCrypt, connects certain bodily characteristics with spiritual qualities. It is not a horoscope⁶⁹. If we accept the existence of a certain connection between the two documents (which seems probable), the theory that it is the birth of a particularly gifted member of the sect that is described seems *a priori* the most likely one. There is not much here to indicate that this birth will be a significant event in the future ordained by God. The description may apply to any 'chosen one of God' to be born at any time.

The individual described is ignorant in his youth but will be wise and endowed with discretion after he has become skilled 'in the three

⁶⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 59.

⁶⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 365.

⁶⁶ *Op. cit.* p. 66.

⁶⁷ *Op. cit.* p. 248f.

⁶⁸ *Op. cit.* p. 366. Cf. in the N.T. Lk, IX, 35, XXII, 35, and John, I, 34 (*v.l.*).

⁶⁹ So rightly Fitzmyer, *op. cit.* p. 370.

books'. He will be attended by **מלכה וערמומה** ('counsel and prudence'). 'He will know the secrets of man, and his wisdom will go forth to all the peoples, and he will know the secrets of all living things. All their calculations against him will come to naught, although the opposition of all living beings will be great.'⁷⁰ Then follows the line quoted above.

It has been thought that the words **מלכה וערמומה** in *l.* 7 refer to *Is.* XI,2, but the actual parallelism in words is very slight, as Fitzmyer remarks.⁷¹ The next line, however, evinces some echoes of the descriptions of the wisdom of Solomon, as Starcky, Carmignac and Fitzmyer have shown; 1 *Kings*, V,9-14; X,2 are mentioned in this connection. The actual parallelism in terminology is, again, not very impressive⁷². *Eth. En.* XLIX, quoted by Dupont-Sommer, shows a number of parallels in thought which it is important to note. In Charles's translation⁷³ this chapter runs:

1. For Wisdom is poured out like water.
And glory faileth not before him evermore.
2. 'For he is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness,
and unrighteousness shall disappear as a shadow
and have no continuance;
Because the Elect One standeth before the Lord of Spirits,
and his glory is for ever and ever,
and his might unto all generations.
3. And in him dwells the spirit of wisdom,
and the spirit which gives insight,
and the spirit of understanding and might,
and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness,
4. And he shall judge the secret things,
and none shall be able to utter a lying word before him;
For he is the Elect One before the Lord of Spirits according to
His good pleasure.'

The context does not seem to be clear enough to allow any definite conclusions to be drawn. There seem to be three possibilities:

- a. The fragment published by Starcky depicts one specific individual endowed with great wisdom and to be sent by God in the future.

⁷⁰ The translation is that of Fitzmyer. There is little difference between the various translations at this point. Only the meaning of **מסרת** in *l.* 9^b is a matter of dispute. The question does not need to detain us here.

⁷¹ *Op. cit.* p. 364.

⁷² Cf. also *Sap. Sal.* VII, 20.

⁷³ *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II, 1913, p. 217.

b. It may be a description of the ideal member of the sect, at any period in its history, or

c. it may describe such an ideal member at that particular juncture in history at which the prediction expressed in 1QS, IV, 19-23 will be fulfilled.⁷⁴

Until more evidence becomes available it will be wise to refrain from using this text for our portrayal of the Qumran ideas concerning the role of intermediaries in God's final intervention in the future.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions reached in this article may be summed up as follows:

1. In any attempt at systematically reconstructing, or even at tracing the supposed development of the expectations of the Qumran sect concerning the divine intervention in the future, we should proceed with great caution.
2. We should bear in mind: a) that in all statements about the future analogies have to be used (in the future the past and the present are reflected as in a mirror), and the use of images ('mythical language') cannot be avoided; b) that different conceptions may have been influenced by different passages from Scripture, and c) that the expectations show a reaction to the actual historical circumstances in which they were born.
3. What will be taught or done is more important than those who will teach and do it.
4. The designations of the intermediaries and even their number may differ.
5. The word משיח should be translated 'anointed one', not 'Messiah'; this term is of secondary importance.
6. God is free to achieve his end in the ways He chooses. He may use no human intermediaries, but only heavenly ones; He may also bring about the radical change in the circumstances of Israel and the world without any instrument at all.
7. The principal point is that God *will* intervene and that His intervention will be radical, decisive, and lasting – in one word: that it will be *final*.

⁷⁴ On p. 371 of his article Fitzmyer puts forward the interesting hypothesis that this text gives an idealized picture of the birth of Noah.

III

JOSEPHUS UND DIE ZUKUNFTSERWARTUNGEN SEINES VOLKES

Das in diesem Beitrag behandelte Thema hat zwei Aspekte: Zuerst muß festgestellt werden, welche Erwartungen Josephus selbst über die Zukunft seines Volkes und der Welt hegte. Gleichzeitig muß man dann aber auch der Frage nachgehen, wie er – aus seiner eigenen Sicht über Gegenwart und Zukunft Geschichte schreibend – die Zukunftserwartungen anderer Juden seiner Zeit beschreibt. In diesem Beitrag liegt der Nachdruck auf dem ersten Aspekt¹.

Die Geschichtsanschauung des Josephus hat nach seinen eigenen Aussagen eine tiefgreifende Wandlung durchgemacht. Als er nach dem Fall von Jotapata kurz vor der Gefangennahme durch die Römer stand und die Wahl hatte zwischen Gefangenschaft und selbstgewähltem Tod, wählte er die Übergabe an die Römer – nach seiner eigenen Überzeugung als Diener Gottes. Die wichtige Passage Bell 3,350–354 ist schon oft analysiert worden. Hier genügt es, darauf hinzuweisen, daß Josephus sich selbst prophetische Gaben zuschreibt, ohne sich Prophet zu nennen². Wesentlich ist ihm, daß Offenbarung aufgrund von Träumen geschenkt wird, durch Inspiration und durch Studium der Schrift. Die Bedeutung früher empfangener Träume wird ihm in der Krisensituation plötzlich durch Inspiration deutlich (*ἐνθους γινόμενος*). So begreift Josephus aber auch gleichzeitig, wie biblische Propheten interpretiert werden müssen. Für Josephus hat Gott jetzt über das zukünftige Los der Juden und des römischen Kaisers deutlich gemacht, „daß alles Glück zu den Römern übergegangen ist“. Josephus übergibt sich den Römern, aber, wie er es in seinem Gebet vor Gott

¹ Für *De Bello Iudaico* wurde die zweisprachige Ausgabe von O. Michel und O. Bauernfeind benutzt (I–III, Darmstadt 1959–1969). Die vor allem in den späteren Teilen sehr reichhaltigen Anmerkungen wurden stets als fruchtbare Hilfe herangezogen (auch wenn sie nicht explizit zitiert werden). Ferner wurde für *De Bello Iudaico* und für die *Antiquitates Iudaicae* die Ausgabe von H.St.J. Thackeray/R. Marcus/A. Wikgren/L. H. Feldmann in der Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge I–IX, 1926–1965) herangezogen.

² Über Prophetie in dieser Periode vgl. vor allem O. Michel, *Spätjüdisches Prophetentum*, in: *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze für R. Bultmann*, hrsg. v. W. Eltester (B.Z.N.W. 21), Berlin 1954, 60–66; O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (W.U.N.T. 6), Tübingen 1960; R. Meyer, *Prophetentum und Propheten im Judentum der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*, in: *ThWB VI*, 813–828; M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, Leiden/Köln 1961, 235–251; J. Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy in Josephus* (Vervielfältigtes Manuskript auf dem Int. Congress of Learned Societies in the Field of Religion, 1.–6.9.1972 in Los Angeles); – über die prophetischen Ansprüche des Josephus selbst vgl. vor allem O. Betz, *op.cit.*, 105–108 und ders., *Die Vision des Paulus im Tempel von Jerusalem/Apg 22,17–21 als Beitrag zur Deutung des Damaskuserlebnisses*, in: *Verborum Veritas* (Festschrift G. Stählin), hrsg. v. O. Böcher und K. Haacker, Wuppertal 1970, 113–123.122, und J. Blenkinsopp, *op.cit.*

bezeugt, nicht als Verräter, sondern als Diener Gottes. Denn Gott hat ihn auserwählt, um τὰ μέλλοντα εἰπεῖν³.

Für jemand, der die Zukunft ansagt, ist es hilfreich und sogar nötig, daß er hervorheben kann, früher von ihm vorhergesagte Geschehnisse seien eingetroffen. Auf diesen Punkt wird in den weiteren Kontakten des Josephus mit Vespasian dann auch viel Nachdruck gelegt. In Bell 3,400–402 führt Josephus sich selbst bei dem Feldherrn ein als ἄγγελος μεϊζόνων und als ὑπὸ θεοῦ προπεμπόμενος, als er ihm und Titus die zukünftige Kaiserschaft und damit die Herrschaft über die ganze Welt ankündigt. Vespasian ist einerseits geneigt anzunehmen, daß Josephus dieses alles sagt, um sein Leben zu retten, andererseits fühlt er sich auf seine eigenen Gedanken, Kaiser zu werden, angesprochen. Josephus sieht auch hier Gott am Werk, wenn er schreibt: „... da Gott selbst ihm bereits Gedanken an die Thronbesteigung eingab und durch andere Vorzeichen die kommende Herrschaft ankündigte“⁴. Was Josephus selbst angeht, so wird untersucht, ob er den Fall von Jotapata und seine eigene Gefangennahme vorhergesagt hatte. Nachdem deutlich geworden ist, daß die Ankündigung des Josephus in diesem Fall zuverlässig gewesen ist, beginnt Vespasian, wie es heißt, „immer stärker an die Wahrheit der Weissagungen, die ihn selbst betrafen, zu glauben“ (Bell 3,408).

Als Vespasian zum Kaiser ausgerufen ist, erinnert er sich nicht allein der anderen Vorzeichen, sondern auch „der Worte des Josephus, der es gewagt hatte, ihn noch zu Lebzeiten Neros als Kaiser anzusprechen“ (Bell 4,623). Er erkennt Josephus denn auch an als τὸν προθεσπίσαντά μοι τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ διάκονον τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ φωνῆς (Bell 4,626, vgl. 3,354). Der Bericht über die Freilassung des Josephus und die Anerkennung seiner Gaben wird dann auch bezeichnenderweise mit den Worten geschlossen: „So erlangte nun Josephus als Lohn für seine Vorhersage den Vollbesitz der bürgerlichen Rechte und kam in den Ruf eines Mannes, der zuverlässig von der Zukunft künden könnte (... περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἀξιόπιστος ἦν Bell 4,629).

Ist man bei diesem Punkt angelangt, ist es nützlich, das Selbstporträt des Josephus mit den Porträts einiger großer Männer der Vergangenheit zu vergleichen, die er selbst in seinen Antiquitates gibt. Oft hat man seit H.St.J. Thackeray⁵ gedacht, daß Josephus sich mit dem Patriarchen Jo-

³ Über die Funktion des Gebetes in Bell 3,354 als Dankgebet nach empfangener Offenbarung und über die Parallelität zwischen dieser Passage und Dan 2,19–23 vgl. die Ausführungen bei W. Grimm, Der Dank für die empfangene Offenbarung bei Jesus und Josephus, in: Das Institutum Judaicum der Universität Tübingen, 1971–1972, 69–78.

⁴ Zu Parallelen bei Tacitus und Sueton vgl. Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit., 1,461f., Anm. 96.

⁵ Vgl. seine Anm. zu Bell 3,352.

seph geistig verwandt fühlte. Aber dieses ist schwer beweisbar. Wohl aber muß angemerkt werden, daß Josephus sich bei seiner ersten Rede vor den Mauern Jerusalems implizit mit Jeremia vergleicht. Er stellt den Widerstand des Zedekia gegen die Babylonier direkt neben den Widerstand der Juden in Jerusalem gegen die Römer und unterstreicht, daß Jeremia nachdrücklich angekündigt habe, „das Volk mache sich Gott durch seine Verfehlungen gegen ihn zum Feinde und werde in Gefangenschaft geraten, wenn es die Stadt nicht übergäbe“ (Bell 5,391f.). Eben dieses betont Josephus auch selbst mit anderen Beispielen in seiner Rede (s.u.). Von Jeremia wird in Ant. 10,79 gesagt, daß er als Prophet *τὰ μέλλοντα τῇ πόλει δεινὰ προεκήρυξεν*, und zwar sowohl das, was unter den Römern als auch das, was unter den Babyloniern geschehen sollte. Auch Ezechiel habe diese Geschehnisse vorhergesagt, und nachdrücklich wird gesagt, daß beide Propheten von Geburt Priester waren (Ant. 10,80, vgl. Bell 3,352). Beim Rückblick auf den Untergang Jerusalems in Ant 10,142 bemerkt Josephus, daß Gott zwar vorher gesagt hatte, was geschehen mußte, daß die Menschen aber mit Unwissenheit und Unglaube reagierten, wodurch sie sich selbst daran hinderten, die zukünftigen Geschehnisse vorherzusehen. Sie wurden so eigentlich durch das Unheil überfallen und konnten ihm nicht entkommen. In dem gleich zu besprechenden Stück Bell 6,285–315 gibt Josephus eine vergleichbare Analyse der Geschehnisse direkt vor dem Untergang der Stadt 70 n. Chr.

Es erscheint als angebracht, noch einige Elemente des Daniel-Bildes herauszustellen, das Josephus gibt. Daniel war nicht allein weise und in der Auslegung der Schriften bewandert (Ant. 10,189), sondern er widmete sich auch der Auslegung von Träumen (*περὶ κρίσεις ὀνείρων ἐσπουδάκει*), so offenbarte sich Gott ihm (*τὸ θεῖον αὐτῷ φανερόν ἐγένετο* Ant 10,194). In Ant 10,266 wird Daniel einer der größten Propheten genannt, geehrt von Königen und vom Volk. Was er aufgeschrieben hat, liest man noch immer, und aufgrund davon, sagt Josephus, sind wir davon überzeugt, daß Daniel mit Gott sprach (*πεπιστεύκαμεν ἐξ αὐτῶν ὅτι Δανιήλος ὠμίλει τῷ θεῷ* 10,267); dazu wird hinzugefügt: „Denn er prophezeite nicht nur immer das zukünftige Geschehen (*τὰ μέλλοντα*) wie die anderen Propheten auch, sondern er stellte auch den Zeitpunkt fest (*καιρὸν ὥριζεν*), an dem das geschehen sollte“. Weiter wird angemerkt, daß Daniel nicht allein über die Not unter Antiochos Epiphanes weissagte, sondern auch über die Geschehnisse unter den Römern (Ant 10,276)⁶.

Daß ein prophetisch begabter Mensch aufgrund dessen, daß seine Worte schon einmal eingetroffen sind, vertrauenswürdig erscheint, wird in den Antiquitates häufig betont. Was Josephus in Dtn 18,22, in der deute-

⁶ Zu textkritischen Problemen vgl. R. Marcus, z.St. – Daß der längere Text ursprünglich ist, zeigt auch die Parallelität mit dem vorangehenden Satz; vgl. auch Ant 12,322.

ronomistischen Geschichtsschreibung und in den Königsbüchern las, wird hier mit besonderem Nachdruck versehen. Ein Beispiel möge genügen: Salomo macht in einer Ansprache an die Menge bei der Einweihung des Tempels die Macht und die Vorsehung Gottes dadurch deutlich, daß er darauf weist, die meisten zukünftigen Geschehnisse, die Gott seinem Vater David geoffenbart habe, seien schon in Erfüllung gegangen, und das Übrige müsse (daher) auch eintreffen (Ant 8,109)⁷.

Wie reagiert nun Josephus, der kraft der ihm geschenkten Einsicht die Zukunft vorhersehen und die Geschehnisse der eigenen Zeit deuten kann, als Historiker auf die Vorhersagen anderer, auf ihre Auslegung der Zeichen und auf ihre Interpretation der Schriften?

Nachdem er in Bell 6,284 erzählt hat, wie 6.000 Menschen in eine der Säulenhallen geflohen waren und jämmerlich beim Tempelbrand umkamen, hält er einen Augenblick inne angesichts der seiner Meinung nach unglücklichen Rolle, die Propheten (hier gebraucht er das Wort „Propheeten“ sehr wohl) während des Aufstandes spielten (Bell 6,285–287). Dieses führt dann zu einer breiteren Darlegung der vielen Zeichen, die in der Zeit vor dem Untergang des Tempels geschehen und durch die große Masse des Volkes verkehrt interpretiert worden waren (6,288–309), und der verkehrten Auslegung der in der Schrift aufgezeichneten Vorhersagen Gottes (Bell 6,310–315). In Bell 6,285 wird gesagt, daß der falsche Prophet den Menschen im Namen Gottes geboten hatte, „zu dem Heiligtum hinaufzusteigen und die Zeichen der Rettung zu erwarten“ (*δεξιμένους τὰ σημεῖα τῆς σωτηρίας*). Diese und andere Propheten waren durch die Tyrannen angestellt, um Mut zu machen; gerade in der Not will der Mensch gern hoffen, sagt Josephus nach Bell 6,286f. – Darum hatten „diese Verführer und Betrüger, die sich fälschlich als Gesandte Gottes ausgaben“ (*οἱ μὲν ἀπατεῶνες καὶ καταψευδόμενοι τοῦ θεοῦ*), auch darin Erfolg, daß sie bewirkten, daß die Menschen die Zeichen (*τέρατα*), die die Verwüstung ankündigten, nicht beachteten oder glaubten (Bell 6,288). Übrigens wird hier auch gesagt, daß diese Menschen sozusagen „vom Donner gerührt waren und weder Augen noch Sinn hatten“ (*ὡς ἐμβεβροντημένοι καὶ μήτε ὄμματα μήτε ψυχὴν ἔχοντες*). In ihrer Sturheit waren diese Menschen wie Toren und dadurch selbst verantwortlich für das Unheil, das sie traf. Gott sorgt gewiß für die Menschen und weist sie vorher auf das hin, was heilsam ist *παντοίως προσημαίνοντα . . . τὰ σωτήρια* 6,310 (vgl. die

⁷ Vgl. vor allem J. Blenkinsopp, op.cit., der weiterhin u.a. auf die Verarbeitung des 1 Kön 13 Berichteten durch Josephus in Ant 8,230–245 hinweist, und ferner die Micha-ben-Jimla-Affäre in Ant 8,401–420. Man beachte auch das in Ant 10,34f über Jesaja und zwölf andere Propheten Gesagte, deren wahre Worte aufgezeichnet seien . . . *καὶ πᾶν εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον γινεται παρ' ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνων ἀποβαίνει προφητείαν*.

Worte des falschen Propheten in 285 und das oben zitierte Ant 10,142). Es ist dem Menschen unmöglich, so stellt Josephus in Bell 6,314 fest, dem Verhängnis (*τὸ χρεῶν*) zu entkommen, auch wenn man es vorhersieht. Die Juden hatten einzelne der Zeichen, die geschehen waren, mißachtet, und andere interpretierten sie verkehrt, nämlich *πρὸς ἡδονήν* („auf eine freudige Erfüllung ihrer Wünsche“, Michel-Bauernfeind). Aus der Vernichtung ihrer Vaterstadt und ihrem eigenen Untergang ist ihr Unverstand (*ἄνοια*) überdeutlich geworden (Bell 6,315). Was auch immer für Faktoren in prophetischen Äußerungen und bei der Interpretation von Zeichen und Schrifttexten wirksam werden: Gott ist zuverlässig, und die Zuverlässigkeit der menschlichen Erwägungen wird am tatsächlichen Gang der Geschichte offenbar.

Josephus' Bericht über die Zeichen vor dem Untergang des Tempels braucht hier nur kurz erwähnt zu werden. Zweifach kommt zur Sprache, wie schwierig es ist, die Zeichen richtig zu deuten. In Bell 6,291 hören wir, nach dem zweiten Zeichen, daß es den Unerfahrenen (*ἄπειροι*) als günstig erschien, daß aber die Gelehrten der heiligen Schrift (*ιερογραμματεῖς*) es richtig mit dem Blick auf das tatsächlich Geschehende auslegten. Nach dem vierten Zeichen – die östliche Tür des Inneren Vorhofes hatte sich von selbst geöffnet – sind es wieder die Unkundigen (*ιδιώται*), die dieses positiv einschätzen: Gott hätte ihnen die Tür zum Guten geöffnet. Die Verteidigen (*οἱ λόγιοι*) dagegen sehen zu Recht hierin ein Vorzeichen der Verwüstung – die Feinde werden von selbst in das Innere dringen können (Bell 6,295f.).⁸

In Bell 6,311–313 führt Josephus zwei Schriftstellen⁹ ins Feld, die beide nicht mit Sicherheit zu bestimmen sind. In 311 demonstriert er den Unverstand der Juden daran, daß sie die Burg Antonia abbrachen, um den Tempel viereckig zu machen, „obwohl sie in den Gottessprüchen eine Aufzeichnung hatten, daß die Stadt und der Tempel erobert würden, wenn das Heiligtum die Form eines Vierecks bekäme“. Es kann sein, daß Josephus verschwiegen hat, daß einer der Gründe, die zur Zerstörung der Antonia führten, das Verlangen nach Herstellung der idealen Tempelmaße war (Ez 42, 15–20, Bell 2,430ff.)¹⁰. Aber diese Hypothese gibt noch keinen Bibeltext an die Hand, auf dem Josephus seine gegenteilige Meinung hätte aufbauen können; man weiß es einfach nicht, welchen Text er meint. Dasselbe gilt von der „zweideutigen Weissagung, die sich ebenfalls

⁸ Vgl. dazu vor allem Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit. II, 2,86ff., Exk. XIV „Die Bedeutung des „Zeichens“ bei Josephus.

⁹ 311 *ἐν τοῖς λογίοις*, 312 *χρησμός ἀμφίβολος ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐρημένος γράμμασιν* und 313 *τὸ λόγιον*.

¹⁰ So Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit. II, 2,190, Anm. 149. – F.F. Bruce denkt in seinem Anm. 16 zitierten Artikel (p.155) auch für andere Stellen an einen Einfluß von Dan 9,24–27, speziell von V.26f.

in den heiligen Schriften fand“, und „die sie aber am meisten zum Krieg aufstachelte“ (Bell 6,312–314). Dieses Wort lautet bei Josephus: „... ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας αὐτῶν τις ἄρξει τῆς οἰκουμένης“. Für Josephus war die Intention deutlich: Dieses Wort zielte auf Vespasian, der in Judäa zum Kaiser ausgerufen wurde. Die Verbindung mit Bell 3,350–354.400–402 ist evident. Andere Ausleger dieses Wortes hatten an einen ihrer Volksgenossen (οἰκεῖον) gedacht, der die Weltherrschaft übernehmen sollte; dieses war nicht allein die Exegese der Aufständischen, sondern auch vieler der Weisen, die nach Bell 6,291.295f. noch die richtige Deutung gegeben hatten. Unser Schluß muß sein: Es geht hier um eine sehr zentrale Passage, die man eigentlich selbstverständlich auf einen Weltherrscher aus Israel hätte auslegen müssen. Josephus steht mit seiner Deutung allein, betrachtet sie aber als durch die Geschehensabläufe gerechtfertigt. – Verschiedene Texte hat man in Verbindung mit diesem Spruch genannt: Gen 49,10; Num 24,17; Dan 7,13f. Es ist schwierig, eine Entscheidung zu treffen. Angemerkt muß werden, daß Gen 49 und Dan 7 in den Antiquitates überhaupt nicht behandelt werden. Die Prophetie Bileams wird in Ant 4,114–117 in ganz abweichender Form wiedergegeben (s.u.). Angesichts des expliziten κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον liegt es nahe, an einen apokalyptischen Text zu denken (vgl. auch den oben zitierten Text Ant 10,267, der sich auf Daniel bezieht)¹¹.

Wir müssen zugeben, daß der Hinweis auf die Schrift, den Josephus hier gibt, sehr undeutlich ist – aber seine Auslegung ist jedenfalls sehr deutlich, und man muß sich die Frage stellen, ob Josephus Vespasian demnach als eine „messianische“ Figur betrachtete. Die Antwort muß, so meine ich, negativ lauten: Josephus gab dem in Bell 6,312 von ihm angeführten Wort eine nicht-messianische Interpretation – und doch kannte er eine mit seinem Volk verbundene Zukunftserwartung auf längere Sicht. Wir können in diesem Zusammenhang zuerst hinweisen auf die erste Rede des Josephus, die er nach Bell 5,362–419 vor der Mauer an die Belagerten richtet. Hierin versucht er, seine Gegner zu einer seiner Ansicht nach realistischeren Sicht zu überreden: Es steht fest, daß praktisch die ganze Welt

¹¹ Zu den mit dieser Passage verbundenen Problemen vgl. Michel-Baurnfeind, op.cit. II,2,190ff., Exk. XV „Der χρησμός ἀμφίβολος und seine Deutung“. Viel ist geschrieben worden über die Berichte in Tacitus Hist 5,13 und Sueton, Vespasian 4. Die Formulierung des Spruches bei Josephus ist deutlich ursprünglicher als die bei den römischen Schriftstellern. Zur Frage vgl. außer den bei Michel-Baurnfeind genannten Autoren auch H. Windisch, Die Orakel des Hystaspes (Verhand. Koninklijke Acad., Afd. Letterkunde, N.R. 28,3) Amsterdam 1929,65–70. Zu den alttestamentlichen Stellen, die möglicherweise im Hintergrund dieses Wortes stehen vgl. auch M. Hengel, op.cit. 243–246; J. Blenkinsopp, The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry, in: JBL 80 (1961) 55–64; ferner den in Anm 16 genannten Artikel von F.F. Bruce, p.157–159; Bruce denkt an Dan 9,24–27.

von den Römern beherrscht wird (5,366f.). Daraus haben die Vorfahren denn auch mit Recht geschlossen, daß Gott an der Seite der Römer steht. In dieser Situation ist es verkehrt und sogar gegen Gottes Willen, gegen die Römer zu kämpfen. Die Geschichte lehrt, daß Gott denjenigen hilft, die sich gänzlich ihm anvertrauen. Aber dann muß man ihm auch so dienen, wie er es will, und darf besonders nicht sein Heiligtum entweihen. „Nach meiner Meinung haben die Hüter der heiligen Stätte alles dem Richterspruch Gottes anheimzustellen und stets, wenn sie ein gnädiges Ohr bei dem höchsten Richter erlangen wollen, Menschenarm und -kraft zu verachten“ (5,400, vgl. 390). Aber wegen aller Sünden, die sie gegenüber Menschen und Gott begangen haben, dürfen die Belagerten nicht mehr mit dem Beistand ihres göttlichen Bundesgenossen rechnen (5,401–403). Natürlich hat Gott Stadt und Tempel verlassen, und er steht nun an der Seite der Römer (5,412 *ὥστε ἐγὼ πεφηνγένοι μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων οἶμαι τὸ θεῖον, ἐστάναι δὲ παρ' οἷς πολεμεῖτε νῦν* vgl. 413)¹². Der einzige Weg zur Rettung ist Bekehrung zu Gott (5,414). Nirgends wird in dieser Rede angedeutet, daß Gott seine Herrschaft für immer an die Römer gegeben hätte. Die Römer stehen auf einer Linie mit den Ägyptern, Philistern, Assyriern oder Babyloniern. Es geht auch nun darum, daß das Volk sich bekehrt und alles von Gott erwartet, dann wird es der Freiheit wirklich wert sein (5,396 cf. 406)¹³. Man beachte, daß in 5,367 gesagt wird, „Gott, der unter den Völkern die Herrschaft von einem zum anderen übergehen lasse, stehe jetzt zu Italien“ (*καὶ κατὰ ἔθνος τὸν θεὸν ἐμπεριάγοντα τὴν ἀρχὴν νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας εἶναι* (vgl. Bell 3,354)¹⁴: jetzt, nicht für immer. Das macht Josephus deutlich, wenn er bei seiner Wiedergabe von Dan 2 nicht mitteilt, was Daniel über den Stein sagt (V.44). Man lese Daniel selbst, schreibt er, „ich halte es für meine Aufgabe, τὰ παρελθόντα καὶ τὰ γεγεννημένα συγγράφειν οὐ τὰ μέλλοντα . . . (Ant 10,210). Man hat hierzu angemerkt, daß Josephus hier keine Interpretation gibt, da dieser Text zu seiner Zeit messianisch interpretiert wurde¹⁵. Wir müssen einen Schritt weiter gehen und feststellen, daß die in Dan

¹² Beachtenswert ist, wie hier wieder die Erfüllung von Vorzeichen eine Rolle in der Rede des Josephus spielt. Nicht allein der Lauf der Geschehnisse weist seit Pompeius darauf, daß Gott die Römer jetzt nicht – wie einst die Assyrier – vernichten wird (Vespasian ist selbst Kaiser geworden!), auch die Brunnen, die einst ausgetrocknet waren, geben seit Titus' Ankunft in der Stadt reichlich Wasser (Bell 5,408–410). Ein derartiges Zeichen hat es nach Josephus auch bei der Einnahme der Stadt durch die Babylonier gegeben (411), und daraus zieht er dann den im Text genannten Schluß.

¹³ Zu „Freiheit“ als Stichwort verschiedener radikalen Gruppen des 1. Jahrhunderts vgl. M. Hengel, op.cit., 114–120.

¹⁴ H. Lindner, Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im *Bellum Judaicum* (A.G.S.U. XII), Leiden 1972, 43, hat diese Passage mit Dan 2,21 in Verbindung gebracht: „Er ist es, der die Zeiten und Verhältnisse wechseln läßt, der Könige absetzt und einsetzt“.

¹⁵ So z.B. R. Marcus in seiner Anm. z.St.

2,44f. angedeuteten Geschehnisse auch für Josephus selbst zu den zukünftigen gehörten¹⁶. Dieses wird explizit deutlich in Ant 4,114–117, wo Bileam sprechend eingeführt wird und Israel segnet. Über einen Herrscher in Israel wird nicht gesprochen, wohl über die Herrschaft Israels selbst. Kanaan wird zu klein werden für dieses Volk: „Wißt, daß die ganze Welt als ewiger Wohnort für euch bereitliegt“ (*τὴν δ'οίκουμένην οικητήριον δ'αἰῶνος ὅστε προκειμένην ὑμῖν*). Überfluß und Friede sollen herrschen, in allen Kriegen wird Israel gewinnen. Sehr nachdrücklich wird gesagt, daß Bileam wohl anders sprechen wollte, aber nicht konnte, weil Gott es ihm unmöglich machte (4,119–123). Josephus selbst fügt als Kommentar hinzu, geheimnisvoll, aber deutlich für den, der es begreifen kann: „Aus all den Prophetien, die nach seiner Vorhersage in Erfüllung gegangen sein, kann man erschließen, was die Zukunft noch zu bieten hat“ (*ὅ τι καὶ ἔσοιτο πρὸς τὸ μέλλον* 4,125). Es ist dann auch durchaus bedeutsam, daß Bileam in seinen Abschiedsworten an Balak sagt, die einzige Weise, Israel zu schlagen sei, es zum Abfall von seinem Gott zu verführen, sodaß Gott selbst es strafen wird (4,130). Sein Rat wird sofort auf die Num 25 beschriebene Weise in die Praxis umgesetzt (4,131–155 und die Schlußbetrachtung 156–158).

Es ist deutlich, daß Josephus für ein Israel, das Gott gehorsam ist, eine glorreiche Zukunft erwartet. Das Römerreich ist nicht das letzte. Er zweifelt nicht daran, daß Gott Israels Bundesgenosse ist und daß seine Hilfe entscheidend ist – aber: seine Gegner haben nicht das Recht, von Gott Hilfe zu erwarten¹⁷. In seiner ersten Rede, aus der wir oben schon öfter zitiert haben, sagt er: „Trotz alledem erwartet ihr nun wirklich Gott als Beistand, gegen den ihr derart gefrevelt habt? Aber natürlich, ihr seid sicherlich fromme Beter und ruft mit heiligen Händen euren Helfer herbei!“ (Bell 5,403). In seiner zweiten Rede bemerkt er spottend gegen Johannes von Gischala, der ihm zugerufen hatte, daß die Stadt „Gottes sei“ (6,98, vgl. 5,548): „Ja, ganz gewiß hast du sie rein gehalten für Gott. Unbefleckt ist immer noch das Heiligtum. Gegen ihn, den du dir als Mitstreiter erhoffst, hast du dich ja in keinem Stück vergangen, und seine althergebrachten Opfer erhält er ja“ (6,99). Es gibt nur eine Möglichkeit zur Rettung: Bekehrung (6,103, vgl. 5,414), und als leuchtendes Vorbild

¹⁶ So auch F.F. Bruce, *Josephus and Daniel*, in: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4 (1965) 148–162, besonders 149.160. Das vorangehende vierte Königreich (über seine Schwachheit wird nicht gesprochen) folgt auf das dritte, von dem Josephus sagt, es komme aus dem Westen (209). Dieses letzte ist das Reich Alexanders, das vierte demnach das Römische.

¹⁷ Vgl. dazu auch Michel-Bauernfeind, *op.cit.* II,1,264f., Anm. 150. In diesem Zusammenhang kann man auch hinweisen auf des Josephus Umdeutung des Ehrentitels „*ξηλωτής*“ in 4,161: *τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ζηλώσαντες τὰ κάκιστα τῶν ἔργων καὶ ὑπερβαλλόμενοι*.

wird dem Johannes dann König Jechonja vorgehalten. Wieder wird zurückgegriffen auf einen Spruch, der zu finden sei „in den Aufzeichnungen der alten Propheten“, den man aber schwer lokalisieren kann. Ganz vage sagt Josephus: „Denn damals haben sie ihre Eroberung vorausgesagt für die Zeit, in der jemand Brudermord beginnt“ (6,109). Das ist jetzt der Fall: Stadt und Tempel wurden durch Leichen entweiht, und Gott hatte, und zwar mit den Römern, ein Reinigungsfeuer zu entfachen (6,110)¹⁸.

Wie aus der 2. Rede des Josephus hervorgeht, wird die Erwartung der Gegner ganz getragen von dem Vertrauen auf Gott als Bundesgenossen (5,389 und 403; 6,99.101 und 5,458ff.), wobei man sich auf die Hilfe für Stadt und Tempel konzentriert – man hofft, daß Gott zum Schluß rettend eingreifen wird (6,285). W.R. Farmer hat mit Recht darauf hingewiesen, daß unter den in der ersten Rede gegebenen Beispielen die Erzählung über die Belagerung Jerusalems durch Sanherib eine sehr große Rolle spielt (5,387f.404–409). Vielleicht haben die in Jerusalem Belagerten sich an dieser Geschichte festgeklammert¹⁹. Nach der Vernichtung des Tempels baten die in der Oberstadt verschanzten Kämpfer Titus, die Stadt verlassen zu dürfen, um sich in die Wüste zurückzuziehen (6,351). Man hat mit Recht darauf hingewiesen, daß auch dieses religiös motiviert ist: Wenn Gott den heiligen Ort nicht mehr schützt, muß man dorthin gehen, wo Gott die Geschichte mit seinem Volk begonnen hat (Dtn 32,7–14)²⁰. Auch andere erwarteten damals in der Wüste ein heilvolles Eingreifen Gottes (s.u.).

Liebe zum Tempel und Sorge um den rechten Gottesdienst im Tempel ist trotz der Art, in der Josephus die Geschehnisse wiedergibt, zu verspüren in der Erzählung der Wahl des neuen Hohenpriesters im Jahre 67 durch die aufständische Gruppe, die Josephus kurz darauf Zeloten nennt (Bell

¹⁸ In Bell 4,386–388 wird gesagt, daß die Zeloten nicht nur menschliche Institutionen, sondern auch göttliche mit Füßen traten und auch *τοὺς τῶν προφητῶν χρησμούς* mißachteten. Sie kannten diese, und dennoch sorgten sie dafür, daß die Prophetie gegen ihr Vaterland in Erfüllung ging. „Denn es gab ein altes Wort von gottbegeisterten Männern, die Stadt werde dann eingenommen und das Allerheiligste nach Kriegsbrauch den Flammen preisgegeben werden, wenn es durch einen Aufstand heimgesucht werde und einheimische Hände den Bezirk Gottes befleckten“. Über die Schwierigkeiten, vor die uns diese Passage stellt, vgl. Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit. II,1,221f., Anm. 101. Sie denken an Dan 9,24–27 als möglichen Hintergrund; dies ist aber ganz unsicher; ebenso auch die Interpretation von Bruce, op.cit. 155f, der bei diesen beiden Texten an Dan 11,30–32; 12,7 denkt.

¹⁹ Vgl. sein Werk *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus*, New York 1956, 99–111. Ihm folgt M. Hengel, op.cit. 246f. – Farmer weist auch auf den Gebrauch, der in Makkabäerbüchern von der Geschichte über Hiskia und Sanherib gemacht wird (op.cit. 97–98).

²⁰ Vgl. wieder W.R. Farmer, op.cit. 116–122, und auch M. Hengel, op.cit. 259–261 und Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit. II 2,202f., Anm. 191.

4,147–157, „Zeloten“ in 160ff.). Josephus, darüber betroffen, daß ange-sehene Priestergeschlechter bei der Wahl ausgeschaltet wurden, kann nicht Worte genug finden, die Unwürdigkeit und Ungeschicktheit des durch das Los bestellten Pinehas zu zeichnen. *Nomen est omen*; man lese Num 25,7–13²¹. Überdies sagt selbst Josephus, daß Pinehas aus einer hohepriesterlichen *φυλή*, sc. Enjachin, stammte. Die durch J. Jeremias aufgestellte Vermutung, man habe gegen die herrschenden hohepriesterlichen Familien auf einen Sadokiden zurückgegriffen²², erscheint als plausibel.

Das Motiv des radikalen Sich-Anvertrauens an Gott tritt auch hervor bei der Beschreibung des entscheidenden Kampfes um die Massada. In der ersten Rede des Eleazar, des Kommandanten von Massada (Bell 7,323–336) wird zu Beginn direkt auf den Aufstand Judas des Galiläers, Eleazars Ahn, hingewiesen (wie in 7,253f. nachdrücklich behauptet wird). Wir waren die ersten, sagt Eleazar, wir werden auch die letzten sein – wir haben damals beschlossen, „weder den Römern noch irgend anderen zu dienen außer Gott; denn dieser allein ist der wahre und gerechte Herr über Menschen“ (7,323)²³. Im Dienst dieses Gottes muß man nun den Tod wählen. Die Fakten zeigen, daß Gott sein Volk hat strafen wollen. Die heilige Stadt ist verwüstet, die Festung Massada ist nicht zu halten – der Grund ist „Gottes Zorn über alle Untaten, die wir in unserer Raserei sogar gegen die eigenen Stammesgenossen wagten“ (7,332). Gottes Strafe muß nun nicht durch die Römer, sondern durch Gott selbst vollzogen werden, und Selbstmord ist der Weg. Der Tod ist der Sklaverei vorzuziehen.

Eleazars Prinzipien sind deutlich; ebenso aber auch die Absicht des Josephus, der am Ende des 7. Buches des *Bellum Judaicum* es sich ergeben lassen möchte, daß die letzten und hartnäckigsten Aufständischen zum Schluß zu der Einsicht kamen, sie seien durch Gott, ihren Bundesgenossen, verlassen worden. Beachtenswert ist wiederum, welche Rolle ein Zeichen spielt: Ein plötzlich sich drehender Wind verursacht, daß das durch

²¹ Über Pinehas als vorbildlichen Eiferer vgl. M. Hengel, op.cit. 154–181.

²² J. Jeremias, Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu, Göttingen³ 1962, II B 52–54 (216–218); ihm folgen Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit. II 2,211f., Anm. 37 und Anm. 40. – Jeremias weist auch hin auf die Anstellung des Ananel durch Herodes 37 v.Chr. In Ant 15,22 nennt Josephus diesen *ιερέα τῶν ἀσημοτέρων*, in Ant 15,40 heißt dieser aber *ἀρχιερατικοῦ γένους*. Vgl. auch Bell 2,7, wo Archelaos konfrontiert wird mit den Männern, die durch Herodes wegen des Vorfalles mit dem goldenen Adler am Tempeltor bestraft worden waren (Bell 1,648–655; Ant 17,151–167); diese Menschen baten um die Absetzung des Hohenpriesters und die Wahl eines frömmeren und reineren (*προσήκειν γὰρ αὐτοῖς εὐσεβέστερον αἰρεῖσθαι καὶ καθαρώτερον* vgl. Ant 17,207). – F.F. Bruce, op.cit. 154, betrachtet Josephus' Nachbetrachtung in Bell 4,318 ü.d. den Tod des Ananias (beschrieben als den Anfang des Endes von Jerusalem) als durch Dan 9,26 beeinflusst. Hier erscheint mir dieser Einfluß in der Tat als erwägenswert (vgl. auch Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit. II, 1,218, Anm. 74).

²³ Vgl. Judas des Galiläers Auffassungen in Bell 2,117; Ant 18,1–10. 23–25.

die Römer entfachte Feuer nicht ihre eigenen Belagerungsmaschinen, sondern eine hölzerne zweite Verteidigungsmauer vernichtet. Eleazar sagt: Dies geschah *οὐκ αὐτομάτως* (7,332). Josephus sagt, als er dieses Geschehen erzählt, daß dies alles geschah *καθάπερ ἐκ δαιμονίου προνοίας* (7,318); die Römer konnten Gebrauch machen von *τῇ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ συμμαχίᾳ*.

Eleazars zweite Rede, viel länger als die erste (7,341–388), behandelt verschiedene Themen. In 359f finden wir das Hauptthema der ersten Rede wieder: Gott hat für das ganze Volk den Tod beschlossen. Hier ist eine höhere Macht am Werk als nur die Römer. Das wurde deutlich aus einer Reihe von Konflikten direkt schon im Jahre 66, am meisten aus dem Verlauf des Krieges, der mit dem Untergang Jerusalems endete. Selbstmord ist der einzige Ausweg: *τούτων τὴν ἀνάγκην θεὸς ἀπέσταλκε* – die Römer wollen gerade das Entgegengesetzte (7,387)²⁴.

Die Zukunftserwartung des Josephus gründet in einem Geschichtsbild, das in verschiedenen Punkten durch das beeinflußt ist, was er in der Schrift las²⁵. Die Beschreibung seiner Gegner suggeriert, daß auch sie eine entsprechende Theologie und Erwartung kannten, nur meinten, Gott auf eine ganz andere Weise dienen zu müssen. Daher interpretierten sie die Fakten anders als Josephus und bleiben bei der Hoffnung auf ein Eingreifen Gottes im Moment (in den Momenten) der größten Not. Wenn die Zahl der Märtyrer so gewaltig zunimmt, muß Gott eingreifen²⁶. Josephus hat die feste Überzeugung gehabt, daß die Geschehnisse ihm Recht gegeben hatten, und daher bekämpft er auch weiterhin seine Gegner in seinen Büchern.

Viel bleibt daher bei der Beschreibung des Josephus undeutlich. Man kann nur weiter kommen, wenn man das bei Josephus Beschriebene ergänzt mit Nachrichten aus anderen Quellen. Aber auch dann bleibt notwendigerweise vieles hypothetisch. Auch wenn man so viel Material zusammenstellt, wie es M. Hengel in seinem in vieler Hinsicht bewundernswürdigen 5. Kapitel „Die Zeloten als eschatologische Bewegung“ seines Werkes über die Zeloten²⁷ tut, bleibt undeutlich, wie die Entwicklung sich vollzog und welche Erwartungen in welchen Gruppen gehegt wurden²⁸.

²⁴ Vgl. Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit. II,2,276ff., Exk. XXIV „Die Eleazarreden“. – Vgl. zum Kontrast die Ausführung des Josephus gegen den Selbstmord in Bell 3,361–382.

²⁵ Dieses Thema verdient eine systematische und viel ausführlichere Bearbeitung als sie in diesem Beitrag geboten werden kann. Auch H. Lindner hat in seinem nach Abschluß dieses Beitrags erschienenen Buch (s.o. Anm. 14) damit nur einen Anfang gemacht.

²⁶ Vgl. M. Hengel, op.cit. 272f. und die dort angegebenen Parallelen. Vgl. auch G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (H.T.St. 26), Cambridge/Mass., 1972, speziell 93–111.

²⁷ S. 235–318.

²⁸ Vgl. über dieses letzte besonders M. Smith, *Zealots and Sicarii, their origins and relation*, in: HThR 64 (1971) 1–19, besonders 12f.

Zum Schluß sei noch auf einige dieser Unsicherheiten hingewiesen: Nur in Bell 6,312 scheint die Erwartung einer zukünftigen heilvollen Herrschaft Gottes die Erwartung eines messianischen Herrschers zu implizieren. Nach Josephus war dieses die Ansicht breiter Volksschichten, nicht nur seiner radikalen Gegner. Wird eine solche Erwartung auch an anderen Stellen von ihm ausgesprochen? Das Wort *χριστός* kommt nirgends vor, außer in Ant 18,63f und 20,200 im Zusammenhang mit Jesus. Aber aus dem Nicht-Vorkommen dieses Wortes kann selbstverständlich nicht geschlossen werden, daß die Erwartung eines von Gott gesandten idealen Königs, Priesters oder Propheten keine Rolle in den von Josephus beschriebenen Gruppen gespielt hätte²⁹. Andererseits darf aus der Tatsache, daß Josephus das in Bell 6,312 berichtete Orakel radikal anders interpretierte und in seiner eigenen Zukunftserwartung keine messianische Figur nennt, nicht abgeleitet werden, daß er deshalb derartige Erwartungen bei anderen mit Absicht nicht berichtete. „Messianismus ohne Messias“³⁰ ist eine bekannte Erscheinung in den Jahrhunderten um Christi Geburt. Es erscheint mir nicht als deutlich, daß einige der Anführer der Widerstandsbewegungen gegen die Römer als gesalbte Könige betrachtet wurden. Von Menahem erzählt Josephus, wie er nach einem Zug nach Massada wie ein König nach Jerusalem zurückkehrt und Führer des Aufstandes wird. Er erweckt aber den Neid der priesterlichen Gruppe um Eleazar b. Ananias und entwickelt sich zu einem unerträglichen Tyrannen. Er wird ermordet, als er „im Schmuck königlicher Kleidung zum Gebet hinaufschreitet“ (Bell 2,444–448). Daß in späten rabbinischen Quellen dem Messias der Name Menahem gegeben wird und daß auch die Vorstellung begegnet, dieser Messias sei zur Zeit des Untergangs des Tempels geboren worden, hat mehr mit Thr 1,16 („Fern von mir ist der Tröster, Menahem, der meine Seele erquicke“) zu tun als mit dieser Episode aus dem jüdischen Krieg³¹. Von Menahem wird nicht gesagt, er sei aus dem Geschlecht Davids gewesen, aber das gilt auch von Simon bar Koseba, der wohl durch Akiba als Messias begrüßt wird. Überdies hat man auf die Tatsache hingewiesen, daß nach Ant 17,271f (vgl. Bell 2,56) ein gewisser Judas ben Hiskia auftrat, nach königlicher Ehre strebte³² und daß auch dessen Vater Hiskia nach

²⁹ Vgl. M. de Jonge, The use of the word „Anointed“ in the time of Jesus, in: *NovTest* 8 (1966) 132–148; ders., The Role of Intermediaries in God's final intervention in the future according to the Qumran Scrolls, in: *Studies on the Jewish background of the New Testament*, ed O. Michel u.a., Assen 1969, 44–63; M. de Jonge – A.S. van der Woude, Messianische Vorstellungen im Spätjudentum, in: *ThWB* IX, 500–518.

³⁰ Zu Begriff und Vorstellung vgl. z.B. A. Gelin, Art. Messianisme, in: *DB Suppl.* 5, Sp.1165–1212.

³¹ Genauere Belege und weitere Diskussion bei M. Hengel, op.cit. 299–302, der aber zum entgegengesetzten Schluß kommt.

³² Sowohl in Bell als auch in Ant ist Judas ben Hiskia der erste aus einer Gruppe von dreien. Der zweite ist der königliche Sklave Simon (Bell 2,57–59; Ant 17,273–277),

Ant 14,159 (Bell 1,204) durch Herodes als Bandenführer in Galiläa hingerichtet wurde. Dieser Hiskia verfügte nach Josephus über einen großen Anhang unter den Angesehenen in Jerusalem. Dadurch, daß man Judas ben Hiskia mit dem in Bell 2,117f und Ant 18,1–10.23–25 genannten Judas dem Galiläer identifiziert und unterstreicht, daß die nach Ant 20,102 durch Tiberius Alexander hingerichteten Jakobus und Simon Söhne Judas des Galiläers genannt werden – wie auch Menahem (Bell 2,433) und Eleazar, der letzte Kommandant von Massada, Nachkommen dieses Judas waren (Bell 7,253) – konstruiert man eine Dynastie von Thronprätendenten, die mehr als hundert Jahre aktiv gewesen sein soll. Die Identifikation der zwei Judasse ist aber ganz hypothetisch und selbst nicht wahrscheinlich³³. Judas der Galiläer wird *σοφιστής* genannt (Bell 2,118.433)³⁴, Führer einer religiösen Gruppierung (Ant 18,23), Prediger einer sehr konsequenten Anschauung über die Alleinherrschaft Gottes. Freilich wird auch Menahem in Bell 2,445 *σοφιστής* genannt.

Noch viel hypothetischer sind die messianischen Züge im Bilde Simon bar Gioras. Im Grunde genommen stützt man sich bei den Versuchen, in Simon bar Giora auf irgendeine Weise einen messianischen König wiederzufinden, auf Bell 4,510, wo gesagt wird, daß Simon aus allen Gruppen des Volkes viele Anhänger hatte, „die ihm wie einem König gehorchten“, und auf Bell 4,575, wo das Volk in Jerusalem ihn als seinen Retter und Beschützer umjubelt³⁵.

der dritte ist der Hirte Anthrongaios (Bell 2,60–65; Ant 17,278–284). Diese werden eingeführt mit dem Satz: „Die Lage der Dinge stachelte viele dazu auf, nach der Königswürde zu streben“ (Bell 2,55); mehr wird von diesen dreien auch nicht berichtet. Es besteht kein Grund, hier an „Messiasse“ zu denken (gegen M. Hengel, op.cit. 297–299).

³³ So auch vorsichtig Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit. I,412, Anm. 204: „kann nicht mit Sicherheit begründet werden“ und sehr ausdrücklich gegen eine Identifikation: K. Lake (vgl. M. Smith, op.cit. p.3), in: *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I The Acts of the Apostles*, London 1920, App. A „The Zealots“, 421–425. – Für eine Identifikation spricht sich aus M. Hengel, op.cit. 337–339.

³⁴ In Bell 1,650.655; 2,10 und Ant 17,152.155 werden die am Vorfalle mit dem Adler am Tempeltor beteiligten Schriftgelehrten *σοφισταί* genannt. Michel-Bauernfeind sagen in ihrem Kommentar zu Bell 1,650 (op.cit. I,425, Anm. 263): „Der Titel *σοφιστής* wird bei Josephus gewöhnlich zur Bezeichnung von Schulhäuptern oder bedeutenden Lehrern verwendet“. In 2,433 übersetzen sie das Wort mit „Gelehrter“, in 2,445 aber plötzlich mit „der wortverwandte Volksverführer“ (Thackeray: „the arrogant doctor“). Letztere Übersetzung ist, wie ich meine, nicht richtig, obwohl *σοφισταί* in c Ap 2,236 zur Benennung griechischer Schriftsteller parallel mit dem Ausdruck *μειρακίων ἀπατεῶνες* vorkommt.

³⁵ Vgl. für eine entgegengesetzte Meinung Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit. II,1,230, die in der Tat nur von „messianischen Zügen“ sprechen. M. Hengel, op.cit. 303f: „... erhob wohl Ansprüche auf die messianische Würde“. Man kommt nicht weiter als zu Vermutungen.

Die Propheten, die vor und während der Belagerung Jerusalems eine Rolle spielten (s.o.), sind, soweit wir wissen, nur Ankündiger des Heils gewesen. Der von den Zeloten als Hoherpriester erwählte Pinehas (s.o.) wurde gewiß als ein besserer und heiligerer Hoherpriester betrachtet als seine Vorgänger. Ob man ihn schon als den idealen Priester der neuen Ära sah (wie man einen solchen z.B. in Qumran erwartete) — oder ob man hoffte, Gott werde, da der Tempel jetzt richtig verwaltet sei, nun die große Wende herbeiführen, ist nicht (mehr) festzustellen.

In Bell 2,258–260 (vgl. Ant 20,167f) nennt Josephus nach den *λησται* und den *σικάριοι* noch andere böse Menschen, „deren Hände zwar reiner, deren Gesinnung aber um so gottloser waren“ und „die nicht weniger als die Meuchelmörder zur Zerstörung des Glückes der Stadt beitrugen“. Josephus meint damit falsche Propheten, *πλάνοι . . . και ἀπατεῶνες*, die göttliche Inspiration vortäuschten und Unruhe stifteten. Typisch für sie ist, daß sie Menschen aufrufen, in die Wüste zu ziehen *ὡς ἐκεῖ τοῦ θεοῦ δειξόντος αὐτοῖς σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας*³⁶. Es handelt sich deutlich um Propheten, die Züge des Moses tragen und die in der Wüste ein neues Eingreifen Gottes erwarteten³⁷. Josephus nennt direkt danach einen falschen Propheten aus Ägypten (Bell 2,261–263), der viele Menschen in der Wüste zusammenkommen ließ und zum Ölberg führte. Im Parallelbericht Ant 20,169–172 wird deutlich gesagt, daß er die Mauern von Jerusalem einstürzen lassen will — so das Jericho-Wunder des Moses-Nachfolgers Josua imitierend. In Ant 20,97–99 wird weiter ein gewisser Theudas genannt, ebenfalls ein Prophet und ebenso ein neuer Josua, da er verspricht, den Jordan zu teilen und seine Nachfolger sicher an das andere Ufer zu bringen. Vergleichbare mosaische Propheten finden wir ferner in Ant 18,85–87 zur Zeit der Unruhe in Samaria unter Pilatus und in Bell 7,437ff bei dem „Aufstand“ in Cyrene, wo der Weber Jonathan seine Nachfolger in die Wüste führt, *σημεῖα καὶ φάσματα δείξω ὑποσχνούμενος*. Obwohl Josephus selbst berichtet, daß der Haufen unbewaffnet war und daher keine wirkliche Gefahr für die Römer bedeutete, stellt er dieses Beispiel des „Wahnsinns der Sikarier“ in ein sehr schlechtes Licht und malt die Bosheit des Jonathan breit aus. Jonathan scheint viele Menschen in Cyrene und Rom, darunter auch Josephus, fälschlich beschuldigt zu haben, und zwar auf Anstachelung des römischen Statthalters Catullus. Hier ist Josephus deutlich zu sehr parteiisch, um ein objektives Bild der Situation zeichnen zu können. Die Tatsache, daß er in Bell 2,264 die *γόητες* und *ληστροκοί* trotz der vorher genannten Verschiedenheiten doch

³⁶ Diese Menschen treten auf unter Felix. Vgl. auch den Bericht — vielleicht eine Dublette — in Ant 20,188 über den „Betrüger“ unter Festus und die Bitte nach Bell 6,351, in die Wüste gehen zu dürfen (s.o.).

³⁷ Über derartige Propheten vgl. die in Anm. 2 genannte Lit. und speziell R. Meyer, ThWB VI, 826f.

zusammen für den Aufstand verantwortlich macht, daß er in allen Fällen erzählt, der römische Statthalter habe mit großer militärischer Macht eingegriffen und daß er selbst einmal (Bell 2,262, nicht in der Parallele in Ant) berichtet, der Betroffene (der Prophet aus Ägypten) habe die Absicht gehabt, sich zum Herrscher über das Volk aufzuwerfen, darf uns nicht dazu verleiten, zu meinen, wir hätten es hier mit Menschen zu tun, die königliche oder andere herrscherliche Absichten hatten. Es sind Propheten, die dem Volk die unmittelbar vor der Tür stehende Befreiung von Gott her versprechen. Natürlich bedeutet dieses Eingreifen Gottes, daß Gott von da ab sein Volk regieren wird, und überdies hat es politische Konsequenzen, die die Römer gesehen haben³⁸. Aber es ist eine Fehldeutung, wenn man hier von (Pseudo-)Messiasen spricht³⁹. Josephus verdeutlicht, daß sie sich selbst als Propheten ausgaben. Daß er sie als Verführer betrachtet, hängt natürlich wieder zusammen mit seiner Auffassung, die geschehenden Fakten der Geschichte hätten fortwährend bewiesen, daß ihre Prophetie eine falsche Prophetie war⁴⁰.

³⁸ So auch O. Michel, Spätjüdisches Prophetentum, 65–66.

³⁹ Es ist nicht empfehlenswert, mit M. Hengel, op.cit. 238, aufgrund der Angaben bei Josephus und mit Verweis auf Mk 13,22 (par.Mt 24,24) die These aufzustellen: „Bezeichnend ist auch, daß bei Josephus und in den Evangelien die Grenze zwischen Pseudomessias und -prophet fließend ist.“ Für Josephus kann er allein auf Bell 2,262 verweisen.

⁴⁰ Josephus nennt auch noch eine Anzahl essenischer Propheten für die Jahrhunderte vor dem jüdischen Krieg: Judas (Bell 1,78–80; Ant 13,311–313), Menahem (Ant 15,373–379), Simon (Bell 2,113f; Ant 17,345–348). In allen diesen Fällen bezieht sich die Prophetie auf politische Geschehnisse, und es ist keine Rede von „messianischer“ Erwartung; vgl. auch zur Prophetie unter Pharisäern: Pollio und Samaia Ant 14,172–176; 15,3f.370. In Ant 17,41–43 prophezeien Phariseer, daß Pheroras König anstelle von Herodes werden soll; hier kann es sich um nicht mehr als eine gewöhnliche Zukunftsvorhersage gehandelt haben. Allerdings ist sie nach 17,44–45 verbunden gewesen mit der Verheißung an den Eunuchen Bagoas, er werde Kinder haben. R. Marcus und A. Wikgren merken hier an: „The meaning is uncertain. A messianic significance has been suggested; cf. Isa. Ivi 1–5“. – Vgl. auch Michel-Bauernfeind, op.cit. I,439, Anm. 83 und O. Michel, Spätjüdisches Prophetentum, 60–61.

IV

THE USE OF Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ IN THE PASSION NARRATIVES

(Report of a Seminar)

I. Introduction

"It was in Antioch that the disciples first got the name of Christians" — so Acts XI, 26 tells us. They were called Christians, because they were adherents of " (the) Christ ". Acts XI 25 mentions the teaching activity of Barnabas and Paul in Antioch, and, indeed, it is in the letters of Paul that the word *χριστός* is used most often in the New Testament, either together with the name Jesus or independently. And hardly as title, rather as a second " proper " name, virtually interchangeable with " Jesus " ¹. Perhaps we may draw a comparison between the use of the names " Jesus " and " Christ ", together and apart, and that of " Simon " and " Peter " in the case of the well-known apostle. ²

In any case two things are clear, as N. A. Dahl and W. Kramer have shown : First that Paul's use of *χριστός* is determined by what happened to Jesus of Nazareth. " Der Christus-Name ist bei Paulus kein von der Person und dem Werk Jesu Christi ablösbarer Titel. " ³ The use as a name presupposes a complete " christianization " of the title. Secondly, Paul's use of this appellation goes back to an earlier use of the word, which is equally " christianized ". After the careful investigations of W. Kramer in his *Christos Kyrios Gottessohn* ⁴ two facts stand out :

1. See e.g. N. A. DAHL, *Die Messianität Jesu bei Paulus*, in *Studia Paulina*, Haarlem, 1953, p. 83-95, W. KRAMER, *Christos, Kyrios, Gottessohn* (ATANT 44), Zürich-Stuttgart, 1963, p. 203-214.

2. So K. BERGER, *Zum Traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel*, NTS 17 (1971-72), 391-425, esp. p. 391-392 and W. GRUNDMANN, art. *χρίω κτλ.* D. *Die Christus-Aussagen des Neuen Testaments*, TWNT IX, p. 518-570, esp. p. 535, n. 326.

3. N. A. DAHL, *op. cit.*, p. 87, see also p. 160 of his article *Der gekreuzigte Messias in Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus* ed. H. Ristow und K. Matthiae, Berlin, 1964, p. 149-169 : " als ein durch die Person und das Werk Jesu Christi inhaltlich gefüllte Name ".

4. Especially p. 15-60.

First, that the title *χριστός* is especially used in connection with the expressions *πιστεύειν εἰς (πίστις)*, *κηρύσσειν, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* and *ἀπόστολος*. This means that the title *χριστός* is connected with the proclamation of the gospel by those who were authorized to preach it, and with the confessing of the faith — particularly at baptism. K. Berger has rightly connected this use of the word with the tradition of the prophet, anointed with the Spirit, which he finds in Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah and elsewhere.⁵

Many other texts show that *χριστός* was also particularly used in formulas speaking of the death of Jesus and in double formulas dealing with his death and resurrection. (Not in the oldest formulas that speak of the resurrection only; they mainly mention God as subject and Jesus as object). It is here, especially, that W. Kramer arrives at the conclusion that the word *χριστός* is entirely "filled" with what Christians testify concerning Jesus, particularly his death on behalf of (*ὑπέρ*) others, and his resurrection. The missionary preaching with which *χριστός* is connected has completely altered the contents of the title⁶.

How can we explain this early, frequent and completely Christian use of the word *χριστός*? At least two problems ask for a solution. First, that of the relation between the Christian use of the word and Jesus' use of it. We shall not go into that problem here, but simply note that the infrequent use of the title *χριστός* in the Synoptic Gospels, particularly in Mark, and their tendency to portray Jesus as avoiding the use of that word (or at least being very cautious in using it), are generally thought to reflect a historical situation. Jesus must have assigned to himself a crucial position in God's dealings with mankind, but it is not certain that he called himself "the Messiah"⁷.

5. *Op. cit.*, p. 393-400.

6. Again K. BERGER (*op. cit.*, p. 399f.) has tried to explain this against the background of the tradition of the anointed prophet, legitimated by God through the gift of the Spirit. He makes a number of illuminating remarks about the vindication through exaltation of God's prophetic servants, about the use of the term anointing in Rev. XI, 4 and about martyr-traditions in Judaism and early Christianity, but he fails to show why the *χριστός* - title was particularly connected with Jesus' passion and death, and with his resurrection only in so far as this is mentioned together with his death.

7. G. Bornkamm speaks for many scholars (inside and outside the school of Bultmann!) when he writes: "Wir haben darum nicht von einer "unmessianischen" Geschichte Jesu vor seiner Passion zu reden, wohl aber von einer Bewegung zerbrochener Messiaserwartungen und von einem als Messias Erhofften, der nicht erst im Augenblicke des Scheiterns, sondern mit seiner ganzen Verkündigung und seinem ganzen Wirken die Hoffnungen, die ihm entgegenschlugen, enttäuschte. Denn, dies ist das eigentlich Erstaunliche, es gibt tatsächlich keinen einzigen sicheren Beweis, dass Jesus einen der messianischen Titel, die ihm die Tradition anbot, für sich in Anspruch nahm," p. 168 in *Jesus von Nazareth*, Stuttgart 1956 (p. 172 in the English edition).

Even if he did, the title was for him not so important and central as it was for the earliest Christian communities after his death and resurrection, and the early Christian use would still call for an explanation.

The second important problem is that of the differences between the *interpretatio christiana* of the word *χριστός* and Jewish expectations concerning the "Messiah". These Jewish expectations are generally thought to center around the conception of the Davidic, royal Messiah. If Jesus called himself "Messiah" he must have filled this designation with a totally different content. Therefore he was very cautious in using it: he wanted to avoid a nationalistic, zeLOTic misunderstanding of the term⁸. But why, in that case, did he use it at all?

But if the *interpretatio christiana* does not go back to Jesus himself, but was the result of theological thinking in the early Church, again the question arises why this so unsuitable title was chosen as a starting point for a radical reinterpretation. We may also ask whether even a thoroughgoing reinterpretation does not presuppose at least some continuity between the Christian and the Jewish conceptions.

These two problems can be approached from various angles. First, we can ask whether the usual picture of the Jewish use of the designation "Messiah" is the right one. In a number of articles the present author has tried to show that it has to be revised drastically. "Messiah" is neither the central title nor is it only connected with a prince of Davidic descent.⁹

Secondly, we can try to explain a number of data in the prepauline material (and the use which Paul makes of it) and in the Synoptic Gospels with the help of Jewish traditions connected with and derived from the Deutero- and Trito-Isaianic conception of the Servant/prophet anointed by the Holy Spirit. This is the course taken by Klaus Berger in two articles which should receive all the attention they deserve¹⁰.

8. So with many, particularly British, scholars T. W. MANSON in his *The Servant-Messiah*, Cambridge, 1953.

9. See M. DE JONGE and A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, art. *χρίω κτλ.*, C. *Messianische Vorstellungen im Spätjudentum*, TWNT IX, p. 500-518; M. DE JONGE, *The use of the word 'anointed' in the time of Jesus*, NT 8, (1966), 132-148; ID., *The Role of Intermediaries in God's final intervention in the future according to the Qumran Scrolls*, in O. MICHEL a.o., *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, Assen, 1969, p. 44-63. Comp. also M. DE JONGE and A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, *11 Q Melchizedek and the New Testament*, NTS 12 (1965-66), 301-326.

10. See the article mentioned in n. 2 and his *Die königlichen Messias-traditionen des Neuen Testaments*, NTS 20 (1973-74) 1-44. One should also note I. DE LA POTTERIE, *L'Onction du Christ*, NRT 80 (1958), 225-252 and W. C. VAN UNNIK, *Jesus the Christ*, NTS 8 (1961-62), 101-116.

Thirdly, there is the view advocated by the late S. G. F. Brandon¹¹ and others. Starting from the fact that "the most certain thing known about Jesus of Nazareth is that he was crucified by the Romans as a rebel against their government in Judea", Brandon questions Mark's presentation of Jesus at his trial and his use of earlier tradition of Jesus as the Messiah. "In other words", he writes, "we must ask whether Jesus had not, after all, been regarded as the Messiah because his word and actions substantially conformed to current expectations".

Also the fourth approach assigns crucial importance to the fact that Jesus was condemned as a political figure as "King of the Jews", therefore as a (false) Messiah. Jesus' death on the cross called for an explanation and compelled Jesus' earliest followers to rethink the whole question of Jesus' Messiahship with a thoroughgoing *interpretatio christiana* as a result. In this view Jesus' followers used the word because their opponents had made it the central issue in the legal proceedings against Jesus¹².

But had they? Can it really be substantiated that the "titulus" on the cross in Mark XV,26 is historical? And is it really certain that it became an important factor in the process of christianization of the Messiah-title? Moreover, how could Jesus' opponents accuse him as a political Messiah — was not his condemnation the result of a complete misunderstanding and misrepresentation of his real intentions? Would not the (false) accusations presuppose the use of the title "Messiah" by Jesus or people in his immediate surroundings already before his condemnation?¹³

In the introduction to the seminar, which concentrated on the pros and contras of the fourth approach, it was argued that we should be cautious about answering historical questions before having dealt with the literary documents and the earlier traditions (possibly) incorporated in them. Also a note of warning was sounded not to explain discrepancies and unevennesses in the literary sources too readily with the help of hypotheses of a historical nature. The study of the narratives

11. In his *Jesus and the Zealots*, Manchester 1967; the following quotations were taken from p. 1 and p. 10 respectively.

12. So e.g. F. HAHN, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*, Heidelberg, 1963, p. 176-179; R. H. FULLER, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, London, 1965, p. 108-111, 158-162; W. GRUNDMANN, TWNT IX, p. 530-532 who, however, connects the Messiah-title also with Jesus' charismatic activity through the Spirit.

13. So N. A. DAHL in *Der gekreuzigte Messias* (see n. 3 above), p. 167. Jesus could not deny the Messiah-title before the Sanhedrin without denying the final, eschatological meaning of his mission (p. 167). Dahl who agrees with Bornkamm's words on "eine Bewegung zerbrochener Messiaserwartungen" (see n. 7 above) emphasizes that in all Jesus' preaching and behaviour the willingness to self-sacrifice must have been prominent.

of Jesus' hearings before the Sanhedrin and before Pilate has shown too many historical short-circuits already.

Therefore much time was devoted to a study of

II. Mark XIV, 53-XV, 47 as part of the Gospel of Mark

I. SURVEY OF THE CHRISTOLOGICAL TITLES IN MARK XIV,XV

XIV,12-16: *ὁ διδάσκαλος* in v. 14 (parallel to *ὁ κύριος* in XI,3).

17-25: *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in v. 21, with *παραδίδοσθαι* as in v. 41 (compare IX,31; X,33; and III,19; XIV,10.11.18.42.44). Reference to (future) *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* in v. 25.

26-31: implicitly *ὁ ποιμήν*.

32-42: In v. 36 Jesus uses *ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ* while addressing God in prayer — a prayer for complete obedience and unity of will between Son and Father. This relationship between Father and Son is presupposed in all that follows and, indeed, in the whole Gospel.

43-52: On v. 41 see on v. 21. In v. 45 Judas addresses Jesus as "rabbi". Vv. 48-49 may be important because of the opposition between *ὡς ἐπὶ ληστήν* and *καθ' ἡμέραν ἡμην ... ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων*.

53-54 and 66-72: only *ὁ Ναζαρηνός* in v. 67.

55-65: v. 61 *ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ*
v. 62 affirmative answer, but in the sequel *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is used.

In v. 65 Jesus is asked to *prophecy*.

XV, 1- 5: In v. 2 Pilate asks *σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων* and the answer is *σὺ λέγεις*.

6-27: Pilate refers to Jesus as "the King of the Jews" in v.9 and as "the man you call King of the Jews" in v. 12. The soldiers salute Jesus with the words "Hail, King of the Jews" in v. 18, and the inscription on the cross in v. 26 mentions this same title.

Clearly XV,1-26 centers around the condemnation of Jesus as "King of the Jews". This designation is connected with *ὁ χριστός* only in the next pericope.

29-32: v. 29 *ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν* etc., parallel to XIV,58.

v. 32 *ὁ χριστός, ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ*, parallel to XIV, 61.

33-39: The centurion's confession: "Truly this man was the Son of God" is the final title used in this narrative.

2. ANALYSIS OF MARK XIV,55-65¹⁴

The verses 55 and 64b emphasize the explicit intention of the Jews to kill Jesus. For Mark Jesus is subjected to a completely unfair trial. In the verses on the false witnesses, vv. 56-59, directly following on v. 55, the one concrete example of such a false testimony in vv. 57-58 calls for comment. There is an inner contradiction between v. 59 (parallel to v. 56b) and the fact that the accusation is quite straightforward. Moreover Mark seems to connect v. 58 with v. 61, just as v. 32 follows v. 29 in XV, 29-32. Below¹⁵ it will be argued that "building the temple" is a typical *Solomonic* activity. Does Mark suggest that a genuine word of Jesus was misunderstood and misrepresented, and that, therefore, it did not become clear in what sense Jesus could be called "son of David"? In vv. 60-61a Jesus' refusal to reply to the charges of these witnesses contrasts with his clear answer on the question of the High Priest in v. 62. We may compare XV, 2 and 4 (in opposite order!)¹⁶. In vv. 61b-62, a crucial passage for the present investigation, the following points may be mentioned briefly.

a) Jesus' affirmative answer is to a question concerning ὁ χριστός, but this title is interpreted by the following designation ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἐυλόγητοῦ. Also elsewhere (as will be shown) Mark emphasizes that Jesus is the Son of God — see, in particular, XV, 39!

b) The primary function of Jesus' additional words in v. 62 is to emphasize that the present judges will be judged by the one who now stands before them. Jesus, the true confessor, the martyr, will be vindicated by God and will return as judge in power and glory.

c) The question may be asked whether the emphasis is on the designation "Son of Man" or on the function of this "Son of Man" in the future; the latter alternative seems to be the more probable one¹⁷. It is important to note that the clear reference to Dan VII, 13 and the

14. On II, 2, 3, 4 see especially H. VAN DER KWAAK's monograph *Het Proces van Jezus*, Assen, 1969, p. 13-96 and J. GNILKA, *Die Verhandlungen vor dem Synhedrion und vor Pilatus nach Markus 14,53-15,5*, *Ev. Theol. Komm. z.N.T.* Vorarb. Heft 2, Zürich/Neukirchen, 1970, p. 5-21.

15. See on X,46-XII,44 under II,5.

16. On these and other parallels see on XV, 1-27 under II, 3.

17. On b and c see especially K. BERGER, *Die königlichen Messiasstraditionen*, p. 18 "Die Ankündigung des Menschensohnes ist eine Gerichtsdrohung" and (too categorically): "der Menschensohn muss hier nicht unmittelbar mit den christologischen Titeln zu tun haben." This is hardly true of Mark himself. It should be emphasized that in the light of Mark XIII, 26 ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ can only be interpreted as a return in glory.

less clear reference to Psalm CX, 1 point implicitly to Jesus' future exercise of royal authority. We shall return to this in our discussion of Mark XII, 35-37, where Psalm CX, 1 is quoted and commented upon — at a redactionally very important point in the Gospel¹⁸.

d) Particularly for Mark, who "sandwiches" ¹⁹ the story of Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin in between the two parts of the story of Peter's denial in vv. 53-54 and 66-72, there is a clear contrast between Jesus who affirms his true dignity and is ready to die, and Peter who denies Jesus — notwithstanding the fact that in Mark's presentation he was the first to confess Jesus as the Messiah (VIII, 29).

e) It is remarkable that God is referred to as "the Blessed One" by the High Priest and as "the Power" by Jesus. This is generally thought to reflect Jewish caution in using the divine Name²⁰. Whether these words were taken over by Mark (who, admittedly, uses the designation "Son of God" without any reservation), or were purposely introduced by him at this point, is not clear.

This last question leads us to a discussion of the accusation of *βλασφημία* in v. 64. It is clearly not a case of blasphemy in the sense of M. Sanh. VII, 5. As we have just noted Mark is at great pains to show that not only the use of the divine Name but also that of the word "God" was avoided. In order to determine Mark's view on this matter we may point to II, 7 where the first attack of the scribes on Jesus (still in Galilee) is mentioned: *βλασφημεῖ τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός*; The next parallel in Mark is III, 20-35 where Jesus' relatives regard him as mad (*ἐξέστη*) and the scribes from Jerusalem accuse him of diabolic inspiration. In vv. 28-29 the issue is again *βλασφημία*. This time the word is used by Jesus himself: to say of him who is inspired by the Holy Spirit that he has an unclean spirit amounts to *βλασφημία* against the Holy Spirit. This scene in Mark is rounded off in vv. 32-35²¹

18. See, again, section II, 5 below.

19. For this term, and examples of such an arrangement in Mark, see e.g. F. NEIRYNCK, *Duality in Mark* (BETL 31), Leuven, 1972, p. 133.

20. Members of the seminar emphasized that it is difficult to find clear contemporary parallels. On *εὐλογητός* Billerbeck, II, p. 51 mentions Eth. En. LXXVII, 1 "He who is blessed for ever" parallel to "the most High" (transl. R. H. Charles) and M. Berakoth VII, 3 "Bless ye the Lord who is to be blessed" (transl. H. Danby). J. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, London, 1947, p. 342 remarks "This is not a Hebrew expression and must be a later addition;" it is scarcely an abbreviation of the habitual "the Holy One, blessed be he."

On "the Power" see Billerbeck, I, p. 1006f. and A. M. GOLDBERG, *Sitzend zur Rechten der Kraft. Zur Gottesbezeichnung Gebura in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur*, BZ NF 8 (1964), 284-293. According to Goldberg there is no earlier use of the Hebrew expression *gebura* for God than in the Mekhilta.

21. Again an example of Mark's sandwich-arrangement, see n. 19 above.

with a discussion on Jesus' true kindred. It indicates implicitly that Jesus fulfills God's will completely (comp VI, 1-6) and thereby refers to his special relationship with God.

In the light of these Marcan parallels we may assume that for Mark the charge of *βλασφημία* was connected with Jesus' claim to divinely inspired authority, rooted in his special relationship with God ²².

In v. 65 Mark records the mockery of Jesus. By mentioning it here, he makes the members of the Sanhedrin responsible for it; this is entirely in keeping with vv. 55 and 64b. Remarkable is the reference to prophetic gifts in Jesus, although the title "prophet" is not used ²³. There may be a connection with the accusation of blasphemy as interpreted above.

Reviewing this rather rapid analysis of Mark XIV, 55-65 we may say that this pericope occupies a central position in the Gospel's picture of Jesus' dealings with the Jewish authorities and, at the same time, in its christological argument ²⁴. It is clear that a comparison with other christological passages in the Gospel is called for. This will be carried out under II, 5. In the meantime, however, we have to look at chapter XV.

3. ANALYSIS OF MARK XV, 1-27

There are a number of parallels between the pericope of the hearing before Pilate and that of the hearing before the Sanhedrin ²⁵, just as

22. See especially K. BERGER, *Die königlichen Messiastraditionen*, § 2 B on the christological titles in Matth. XI-XII and § 2 E on Jesus before the Sanhedrin. On p. 19 Berger writes: "Blasphemie bedeutet: behaupten dass man das wahre Pneuma besitzt (obwohl man es nicht besitzt) und zugleich es der Gegenseite absprechen (die es gleichwohl besitzt)". See also K. BERGER, *Die Amenworte Jesu* (BZNW 39), Berlin, 1970, p. 36-41 on Mark III, 28f. One should also note the use of *βλασφημείν* in Mark XV, 29.

23. Matthew (see III, 1 below) adds *χριστέ*, over against "king of the Jews" in the parallel scene after the hearing before Pilate. On the text-critical and grammatical problems in this verse see V. TAYLOR, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1952, *ad loc.*

24. J. GNILKA, *op. cit.* (see n. 14 above), p. 15: "... dass das Messiasbekenntnis 14, 61f. in dem der „Sohn des Hochgepriesenen“ appositionell zum „Christus“ steht, als interpretatio christiana zu werten ist". Jesus' yes is repeated in the true Christian confession of the Church. Negatively, it should be remarked that Jesus' silence in v. 61 and the mockery in v. 65 do not warrant the assumption that Mark wanted to suggest the picture of the Deutero-Isaianic Suffering Servant.

25. See especially G. BRAUMANN, *Markus 15: 2-5 und Markus 14: 55-64*, ZNW 52 (1961), 273-278. Even if Mark took over the Pilate-scene from an earlier source (and we shall argue that he did), his redactional activity will have left its mark on both stories. It is too simple to suppose that Mark XIV, 55-64 was modelled upon the second story.

there are further parallels between the stories connected with them (see e.g. XIV, 65 and XV, 16-19). We may see here Markan (or earlier) redaction at work.

The very full and difficult verse XV, 1 serves as a connection between the two stories. H. van der Kwaak has argued convincingly that it is a redactional verse, for which Mark is responsible²⁶. Nevertheless the second trial is not properly introduced and we may conjecture that Mark inserted here an originally independent story in his narrative. The following are worth noticing :

a) The readers are supposed to know who Pilate is, without any further introduction.

b) Pilate's reasons for asking Jesus whether he is "the King of the Jews" are not given. The accusations of the Jewish authorities are not mentioned before v. 3 and there they are not specified.

c) In the rest of the story we hear that Barabbas was in prison with the rebels who had committed murder *ἐν τῇ στάσει* (v. 7). The readers obviously are supposed to know to which event reference is made. They also seem to be expected to know Alexander and Rufus, whose father Simon of Cyrene is pressed to carry the cross (v. 21).

As was shown above under II, 1 the title "King of the Jews" gives the main theme of the whole passage, culminating in v. 26. Jesus' answer *οὐ λέγεις* implies some qualification of the *βασιλεύς* -title²⁷ and this qualification is given in what follows, particularly also by introducing Barabbas as a contrasting figure. The Jews choose Barabbas and reject Jesus; we are reminded here of XIV, 48-49, where Jesus complains that he is arrested as if he were a *ληστής*²⁸. The soldiers mock Jesus as "King of the Jews" without having any insight into the true meaning of his kingly authority.

The readers of the present Gospel know that Jesus' royal dignity will only be revealed in the future; they read XV, 1-27 against the background of Mark XIV, 62 and XII, 35-37. We should underline, however, that the "King of the Jews" -theme of this section is only

26. *Op. cit.* (see n. 14 above), p. 67-73.

27. "An affirmation which implies that the speaker would put things differently", V. TAYLOR, *op. cit.*, p. 597. See also H. VAN DER KWAAK, *op. cit.*, p. 75-78 who thinks that Mark wanted to stress the paradoxality of the whole proceedings; the rest of the story makes clear that Jesus is crucified as "king" — which he is not, and yet is.

28. Jesus' activity is characterized as "teaching in the temple". The *καθ' ἡμέραν* in XIV, 49 most probably means "day by day." It seems to suggest a longer period of time than Mark allows for. Vv. 48-49 may go back to older material incorporated by Mark at this point.

secondarily incorporated into Mark's main christological argument. This is done by means of the verses 28-32 to which we now turn.

4. ANALYSIS OF MARK XV, 28-39

As we have seen, the verses 28-32 presuppose XIV, 55-65; they are in their present form clearly a product of Markan redaction. The title *χριστός* recurs and is linked with the royal title in its "proper" wording *βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ* ²⁹.

There is, perhaps, also a (negative) reference to the title "Son of God". In v. 29 the *κινούντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν* may be a reminiscence of Ps XXII, 8 ³⁰, because other verses of the same Psalm are quoted in v. 24 and v. 34. Matthew's reference to Ps XXII in XXVII, 43 is clear; so is the parallel with Wisd II, 17f in XXVII, 40, followed by an explicit closing statement *εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός* in v. 43 ³¹.

In Mark the descent from the cross is mentioned twice; once Jesus is exhorted to save himself that way, once this descent is called for as legitimation for Jesus' power and authority... *ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν* (v. 32). Of course Jesus will not be able to save himself, according to the speakers, and therefore he is *not* the man to save others. V. 32 reminds us of the words of the opponents of the righteous man in Wisd II, 17 *ἴδωμεν εἰ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ ἀληθεῖς καὶ πειράσωμεν τὰ ἐν ἐκβάσει αὐτοῦ*. If this righteous man really is God's son he will be saved. Mark may refer here to Wisd II, 17 or a similar line of argumentation concerning the righteous man as Son of God. He may have avoided the designation "Son of God" on purpose, because he wanted to emphasize that the Jews did not recognize Jesus' true dignity, while the non-Jewish centurion recognized it and came to the true Christian confession in v. 39.

All this is, of course, highly conjectural. In any case it seems essential to Mark's christological argument that a non-Jew after having witnessed Jesus' death has the final word. This final word amounts to a confession — the true confession, according to Mark ³².

29. In the New Testament non-Jews use the expression "king of the Jews" whereas Jews speak of "the king of Israel". See also Matth. XXVII 42 over against II, 2 and John I, 49; XII, 13.

30. See also Lam. II, 15.

31. See III, 1 below and K. BERGER, *Die königlichen Messiasstraditionen*, § 2 C, D. Berger does not, however, pay sufficient attention to the Markan form of the story.

32. We should translate: "Truly that man was *the* son of God" — see Bl. Debr. § 273 (with a reference to E. C. Colwell), E. SCHWEIZER, TWNT VIII, p. 381, n. 323. According to P. B. HARNER, *Qualitative anarthrous predicate nouns: Mk 15: 39 and John 1: 1*, JBL 92 (1973), 75-87 the word-order of this verse emphasizes the

In passing it may be noted that the double reference to Elijah in vv. 35-36 does not seem to have any connection with earlier, christologically more important references to Elijah in this Gospel (VI, 15; VIII, 28; IX, 4, 5, 11-13). Here we find the conception of Elijah as helper in distress³³. Unfortunately, Mark XV seems to be the earliest instance in which this conception occurs. Elijah is here a heavenly figure (so also Mark IX) expected (or not expected!) to save Jesus and to transport him to heaven, where a faithful servant of God will be at home after having fulfilled his mission on earth³⁴.

5. MARK'S USE OF CHRISTOLOGICAL TITLES, PARTICULARLY *ὁ χριστός*, IN OTHER PASSAGES³⁵

In Mark VIII, 27-IX, 1 Peter confesses Jesus as *ὁ χριστός*. He speaks on behalf of the disciples who are contrasted with *οἱ ἄνθρωποι*, the outsiders, who think of Jesus in terms of a prophetic figure. The title *ὁ χριστός* is obviously considered to be more adequate, yet the introduction to Peter's confession points to some connection between *ὁ χριστός* and prophecy. Peter and his fellow-disciples have to learn, however, that the title has to be "filled" anew and that confessing Jesus entails living and suffering as Jesus did. This is made clear in VIII, 30-IX, 1 and, in fact, in the whole section VIII, 27-X, 45.

The suffering and dying Son of Man in v. 31 is set over against the Son of Man in v. 38 who will come *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ*. This Son of Man is clearly Son of God, and his coming takes place when the Kingdom of God comes in power (IX, 1). The Son of Man in glory will judge people in accordance to their attitude towards the suffering man Jesus and his preaching (the Gospel, v. 35!) now. The existential nature of the decision asked for is underlined by the exhortation to

qualitative significance rather than its definiteness or indefiniteness. On the connection between v. 38 and v. 39 see M. DE JONGE, *De berichten over het scheuren van het voorhangsel bij Jezus' dood in de synoptische evangeliën*, *Ned. Theol. Tijdschr.* 21 (1966-67), 90-114, esp. p. 108-110.

33. See J. JEREMIAS, art. *Ἥλ(ε)ίας*, TWNT II, p. 930-943, esp. p. 932-933.

34. See on this conception K. BERGER, *Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund*, p. 400-403.

35. See E. BEST, *The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology* (SNTS Mon. Ser. 2), Cambridge 1965; T. A. BURKILL, *Mysterious Revelation*, Ithaca N.Y., 1963; IDEM, *New Light on the Earliest Gospel*, Ithaca-London, 1972; E. SCHWEIZER, *Zur Frage des Messiasgeheimnisses bei Markus*, ZNW 56 (1965), 1-8; IDEM, *Das Evangelium nach Markus (N.T.D.)*, Göttingen 1967, p. 29-30; 206/7-208, M. HORSTMANN, *Studien zur markinischen Christologie (N.T.A., N.F. 6)*, Münster 1969 and Ph. VIELHAUER, *Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums in Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, München, 1965, p. 199-214.

follow Jesus in vv. 34-37 and the short episode of Peter's complete misunderstanding in vv. 32-33.

In the following story of the transfiguration a voice from heaven calls Jesus "my beloved Son" and the disciples who are present are exhorted to listen to him (IX, 7).

From this rapid survey two things become clear. First, there are the parallels between this section of the Gospel and Mark XIV, 55-65. In the latter pericope we do not find a parallel to VIII, 31 for the obvious reason that the situation described there is marked by suffering and death, but apart from that there are many points of agreement. It is clear that Mark accepts the title Christ as an essential part of the Christian confession. He modifies it by pointing to the relationship between Son and Father, by emphasizing the duality of suffering and victory of the Son of Man. The Son of Man will return with royal authority, in glory, in order to judge people in accordance with their attitude towards him in suffering and death.

The next section of the Gospel to be compared (all too) briefly is X, 46-XII, 44. In X, 46-52 the title "Son of David" is introduced, in a context of healing. It is followed by the pericopes of the entrance into Jerusalem and of the so-called cleansing of the temple (XI, 1-25, the latter story "sandwiched" in between the two parts of the story of the withered figtree). In XI, 10 the crowd hails ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαβίδ. Both healing and concern for the temple can be connected with Solomon, the son of David who occupies a central position in the Old Testament and who is traditionally made responsible for the greater part of the writings belonging to the Wisdom literature, including the Psalms of Solomon with their expectation of a wise and powerful anointed king from the house of David. For further details K. Berger's very detailed treatment of the Solomonic "Son of David"-traditions³⁶ may be referred to.

In XI, 27-33 we note that the debate on Jesus' ἐξουσία is carried on in terms of prophetic authority. The point of reference is John the Baptist's authority and it is explicitly stated that the crowd held that John was in fact a prophet (v. 32). Jesus' authority is not defined in this pericope. But Mark adds the parable of the wicked husbandmen (XII, 1-8) in which it is abundantly clear that the δοῦλοι are the prophets and that Jesus is the "beloved son" who is sent last of all, like the prophets yet not a prophet himself, but the son³⁷. The son is killed, like some of the prophets before him.

36. On this see K. BERGER, *Die königlichen Messias Traditionen* § 1. Comp. O. BETZ, *Was wissen wir von Jesus?* Stuttgart-Berlin 1965, p. 60-62.

37. Particularly XII, 5b, an insertion and an anticlimax, makes clear that Mark interprets the servants as the prophets besides and over against Jesus as the beloved

Pointing in passing to XII, 13-17, a pericope which emphasizes that Jesus, as representative of God, is more than a rebel against Caesar³⁸, and XII, 28-34 which describes the kernel of the law to be obeyed by those who want "to pay God what is due to God" (v. 17) in their search for God's kingdom (v. 34), we arrive at XII, 35-37.³⁹ A very important passage, because it forms the end of Jesus' discussions with different groups of people in Jerusalem and returns to the title "Son of David", rather unexpectedly introduced in the Bartimeus-story. In its present place in the Gospel of Mark it tries to define more precisely the relation between the designations *χριστός*, *υἱὸς τοῦ Δαυὶδ* and, I think, "Son of God", though the last title is not introduced explicitly.

Starting with the question how the scribes can say that *ὁ χριστός* is son of David, the attention focusses on the fact that David in Ps CX, 1 calls him *κύριος*. This last title does not play any rôle; the discussion ends with the question "How can he be his (= David's) son?". The answer is not given explicitly, but if we take into account the pericope's place in the section of Mark's Gospel to which it belongs and interpret it against the background of XIV, 62, it is probable that Mark wants to emphasize that there are two stages in Jesus' activity as Son of David. The first is the one described in X, 46-XII, 44: He heals (X, 46-52), is concerned about the true worship in the temple (XI, 27; XII, 35; also XIV, 49!). The crowds listen eagerly, the Jewish authorities do not accept him who repeatedly shows himself superior in debates (XI, 18, 27-33; XII, 12, 17, 27, 34, 35-37, 38-40). The second stage will be the exercise of royal authority when the kingdom of God has come and mankind will be judged; this stage is envisaged in Ps CX, 1 quoted in XII, 36 and presupposed in XIV, 62. In the latter text the designation "Son of David" is not used, but it seems to be implied in the word about the destruction and rebuilding of the temple recorded in v. 58 (comp. XV, 29 and 32). The title "Son of God", central to the argument in XIV, 61-62, is not used in XII, 35-37 but if we see this pericope against the background of the whole of Mark's christology in which it is a central title (see also directly below) we may surmise that *πότεν αὐτοῦ εἶναι υἱός*;⁴⁰ in v. 37 also raises the question of the divine

son. See J. JEREMIAS, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, Göttingen, 1965, p. 67-75, esp. p. 69. Comp. also M. HENGEL, *Das Gleichnis von den Weingärtnern Mc 12: 1-12 im Lichte der Zenonpapyri und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse*, ZNW 59 (1968), 1-39.

38. See a.o. the present author's *Jesus als revolutionair in Jezus, Inspirator en Spelbreker*, Nijkerk, 1971, p. 97-111 where an interpretation of vv. 13-17 in the light of vv. 28-34 is defended.

39. On this pericope (and a survey of recent interpretation) see G. SCHNEIDER, *Die Davidsohnfrage (Mk 12, 35-37)*, *Biblica* 53 (1972), 65-90. Comp. also Chr. BURGER, *Jesus als Davidsohn*, Göttingen, 1970.

40. On *πότεν* see G. SCHNEIDER, *op. cit.*, p. 83 n. 1 who argues that in the present Markan context it should be translated as "why" or "in what respect."

sonship of the Son of David (see e.g. II Sam. VII, 14; Ps II, 7; LXXXIX, 27 and Rom. I, 3-5).

The importance of this brief analysis of X, 46-XII, 44 for the problem that concerns us lies in the fact that it has shown how the problem of the royal aspect of the activity of *ὁ Χριστός* receives ample attention in Mark *already before* XV, 1-27. In the present Gospel this last passage does little more than underline what has already been said, using a different terminology.

As to the further use of *χριστός* and *υἱὸς θεοῦ* in Mark we may draw attention to I, 1 where Jesus Christ is used as a double name. The longer text which adds *υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ* after *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*⁴¹, if not original⁴², shows a clear insight into the christological emphasis of the Gospel. The difficult verse IX, 41 shows that *χριστοῦ εἶναι* is the true characteristic of the disciple; the use of this expression may be compared to that of *χριστιανολί* in Acts XI, 26. In XIII, 21 *ἴδε ὡδε ὁ χριστός* is the announcement of the coming of a false Messiah (v. 22). Here again we find the sequence *ὁ χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (v. 26) and *ὁ υἱός* in connection with *ὁ πατήρ* (v. 32)⁴³.

The proclamation of the Heavenly Voice at Jesus' baptism *σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός...* in I, 11 is directed at Jesus himself. It is repeated in IX, 7, after Peter's confession, to the disciples: *οὗτός ἐστιν...* Before that only the evil spirits have recognized Jesus and worshipped him as "Son of God" (III, 11; V, 7). Demons have the spiritual ability to understand who Jesus really is; the disciples need the proclamation from Heaven and the "Belehrung" connected with it by Jesus himself (*ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ*, IX, 7!). Essential for Mark is Jesus' public affirmation before the Sanhedrin after the High Priest's question in XIV, 61.62 and the equally public declaration by the Roman centurion in XV, 39, both recorded in the context of the story of Jesus' passion⁴⁴.

41. It is found in very many, also old, witnesses, see *The Greek New Testament ad loc.* G.N.T. gives *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* in square brackets in the text.

42. B. M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, London-New York, 1971, *ad loc.* considers expansion more likely than omission. "Yet, because of the antiquity of the shorter reading and the possibility of scribal expansion it was decided to enclose the words within square brackets." In I, 34 the words (*τὸν*) *χριστὸν εἶναι* are probably derived from the parallel in Lk IV, 41 and, therefore, they are not likely to be original.

43. On this verse see now the comments of R. PESCH, *Naherwartungen. Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13*, Düsseldorf, 1968, p. 190-194. Pesch tries to prove that the *οὗδὲ ὁ υἱός* (used very emphatically) is Markan. "Der Evangelist formuliert homologisch... Die Aussage vom Nichtwissen des Sohnes stellt der Evangelist in den Dienst der eschatologischen Zurüstung seiner Gemeinde." (p. 194).

44. On I, 11; IX, 7; XV, 26 as three stages in the enthronisation (adoption, proclamation, acclamation) see Ph. VIELHAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 210-214. For criticism see a.o. T. A. BURKILL, *New Light on the Earliest Gospel*, p. 262 n. 115.

III. The Passion-narratives in Matthew, Luke and John

The seminar could not find time to discuss the parallels to the Markan stories of the hearings before the Sanhedrin and Pilate and that of the crucifixion in the other three gospels. Yet it may be useful to compare Mark's picture at a few christologically important points with different statements and descriptions in Matthew, Luke and John.

I. MATTHEW⁴⁵

In XXVI, 59-67, par. Mark XIV, 55-65 we note that the story of the witnesses who record Jesus' word concerning the temple avoids the difficulties of the Markan account. The men are not explicitly called false witnesses, and it is not said that their testimony was contradictory. In v. 63 the question of the High Priest is put in the form *σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. Jesus' answer in v. 64 is only a qualified yes, *σὺ εἶπας*⁴⁶, followed by *πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν*. The *ἀπ' ἄρτι* which introduces the statement concerning the coming Son of Man seems to emphasize the definitive, irrevocable element in the situation. At this very moment the period of power and majesty, including judgment, begins⁴⁷.

In v. 68 after *προφήτευσον (ἡμῖν)* the title *χριστέ* is added, parallel to the *βασιλεὺ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* in 29 (par. Mark XV, 18). In the Pilate-story Matthew identifies *ὁ χριστός* and *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων* at a much earlier stage in the narrative than Mark; twice Pilate refers to Jesus as *τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν* (in XXVII, 17 and 22). The title "king of the Jews" is used during the hearing in v. 11, during the mockery by the soldiers in v. 29 and in the titulus on the cross in v. 37⁴⁸.

In Matth. XXVII, 39-43, parallel to Mark XV, 29-32, the word *χριστός* is omitted accordingly. The reference to Ps XXII, 8-9 is expressed more

45. In *L'Évangile selon Matthieu*, éd. M. Didier, Gembloux 1972, the report of the « Journées bibliques de Louvain 1970 », we find two articles consecrated to our subject: D. SENIOR, *The Passion Narrative in the Gospel of Matthew*, p. 343-357 and A. DESCAMPS, *Rédaction et christologie dans le récit Matthéen de la Passion*, p. 358-415.

46. So D. R. CATCHPOLE, *The Answer of Jesus to Caiaphas (Matt. XXVI, 64)*, NTS 17 (1970-71), 213-226, who points to XXVII, 40 and 43. There is no reason to assume that Matthew would have preserved here a more historical picture than Mark.

47. See e.g. H. E. TÖDT, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung*, Gütersloh, 1959, p. 76-78. See also XXIII, 39 and XXVI, 29.

48. The wording in Matthew is slightly different from that in Mark. We should note that Pilate's wife calls Jesus "that righteous man" (v. 19, comp. v. 4 and v. 24 v. l.). Wisd. II, 17f., referred to in XXVII, 39-43, calls the righteous man son of God.

clearly by the addition in v. 43a. Matthew emphasizes that the essential question is that of Jesus' divine sonship. He says so explicitly in v. 43b and he adjusts the form of the first challenge in v. 40 accordingly: *εἰ υἱὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*. The formal parallel with Wisd. II, 17-18 is much clearer than it is in Mark⁴⁹.

The words of the centurion in XXVII, 54 do not differ materially from those in Mark. We should note, however, that they are now connected with the earthquake and other events after Jesus' death recorded in vv. 51-53. Moreover they are spoken also by the centurion's men.

2. LUKE

The situation in Luke is more complicated than in Matthew; the differences with Mark are more important and far-reaching and there are a number of additions and omissions.

The story of Peter's denial is not divided into two parts, but narrated as a whole in XXII, 54-65. In v. 61 Jesus is twice referred to as "the Lord" (... καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος... ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κυρίου).

For the mockery in vv. 63-65 it is not the members of the Sanhedrin who are responsible but "the men who were guarding Jesus". There is no mockery after the trial before Pilate by Roman soldiers, but Jesus is ridiculed by Herod and his troops when he is sent to Pilate "dressed in a gorgeous robe" (XXIII, 11)⁵⁰.

In the story of the hearing before the Sanhedrin in XXII, 63-71 no formal condemnation is recorded⁵¹; no false witnesses are mentioned and Jesus' temple-word does not play any part⁵². There are two questions, and they are put by the members of the Sanhedrin, not by the High Priest. The first is concerned with Jesus' messiahship: *εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὸν ἡμῖν*. Jesus' reply is: "If I tell you, you will not believe me; and if I ask questions, you will not answer" (comp. John X, 24-25). The rest of Jesus' answer mentions, again, the "Son of Man" sitting.

49. See under II,4 above, and K. Berger's treatment of the matter referred to in n. 31. One should, of course, also compare Matth. IV, 3 and 6.

50. H. VAN DER KWAAK, *op. cit.*, p. 156-158 draws a parallel with John XIX, 1-3; According to Luke Herod regarded Jesus as innocent.

51. D. R. CATCHPOLE, *The Trial of Jesus*, Leiden, 1971, p. 184-186, points to Acts XIII, 27 *κρίναντες* contra Lk XVIII, 32. (where the *κατακρινούσιν* in the Markan parallel is omitted). Also the *τί ἔτι ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρεῖαν* (v. 71) in his view, points to a formal hearing (*op. cit.*, p. 202).

52. This may have been purposely "postponed" to Acts VI, 14 because earlier in Acts (comp. Lk. XXIV, 53) Christians still regularly worship in the temple at Jerusalem — see M. DE JONGE, *Ned. Theol. Tijdschr.* 21 (1966-67), p. 111-113.

at the right hand of the Power of God⁵³. The exaltation is mentioned, but not the coming on the clouds of heaven. In the second question the members of the council draw their conclusions from Jesus' answer : *οὐ οὖν ἐστὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* ; and the second reply is *ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι* ; it is the answer given in Mark to the one question of the High Priest, with an emphatic *ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι* (over against the *οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε* and *οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε* in v. 68). The theme of *βλασφημία* does not occur, but in v. 65 the word *βλασφημοῦντες* is used with regard to Jesus' guards.

The transition from the account of the hearing before the Sanhedrin to the story of the hearing before Pilate is much easier and clearer in Luke than in the other two Synoptic Gospels. The Jewish leaders appear before Pilate with the straightforward accusation that Jesus claims to be Messiah, King (*λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι*) ; this claim is expounded in terms of revolt against the Emperor (XXIII, 1-5). Pilate's question becomes now intelligible, and right from the beginning of the proceedings in which the Romans are involved *χριστός* is explained in terms of political kingship. Luke emphasizes time and again that the political charge was definitely not accepted (vv. 4, 14, 22). His — obviously secondary — picture of what happened at and after the second hearing serves his apologetic purpose⁵⁴.

Luke's additional account of the hearing of Jesus before Herod (XXIII, 6-12, comp. Acts IV, 25-28)⁵⁵ and Jesus' words to the women of Jerusalem on his way to Golgotha need not detain us here.

The story of the mockery in XXIII, 35-37 is told slightly differently, the responsible people are the leaders who call Jesus *ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός*⁵⁶ and the soldiers who call him *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. Only then the inscription on the cross is mentioned in v. 38. The words of the mockers are taken up by one of the criminals hanging with Jesus on the cross, when he asks to be saved, addressing Jesus as the Messiah. The other criminal rebukes him and asks to be remembered by Jesus : *ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου*⁵⁷. Jesus announces him that he

53. *Ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* (comp. *ἀπ' ἄρτι* in Matth. XXVI, 64) also in I, 48 ; V, 10 ; XII, 52 ; XXII, 18.

54. See H. VAN DER KWAARK, *op. cit.*, p. 140-144, 160-163.

55. On this passage see the full discussion by H. VAN DER KWAARK, *op. cit.*, p. 144-160.

56. Comp. IX, 35 ; John I, 34 in $\aleph^*$ b e ff³ sy^{sc} and Is XLII, 1 LXX (not Matth. XII, 18).

57. So P⁷⁵B L lat ; this reading is found in the Nestle-Aland text. G.N.T. reads *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου* with very many, also ancient, witnesses. B. M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, *ad loc.* announces that the third edition will print the text as it is found in Nestle. A majority of the committee preferred it as more consonant with Lukan theology (see XXIV, 26). Whatever reading is adopted (see also XXII, 29-30 and IX, 26) the conclusion drawn in the text stands.

will be in Paradise that very day (XXIII, 39-43). Luke obviously is at pains to emphasize that Jesus will begin to exercise his royal authority ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν as XXII, 69 has made clear.

The centurion does not confess Jesus as the son of God, he says only : ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν (v. 47, comp. Matth. XXVII, 19⁵⁸). Just before, Jesus' last words have been recorded, addressed to his Father : πατέρ... (v. 46, comp. v. 34 if belonging to the original text)⁵⁹

3. SOME REMARKS ON JOHN

There is no trial before the Sanhedrin in the Fourth Gospel, only a provisional enquiry by Annas who sends Jesus to Caiaphas (XVIII, 12-14 and 19-24). In vv. 19-20 all emphasis is laid (again) on Jesus' teaching ἐν συναγωγῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, in public, for anyone to hear.

The various episodes of the trial before Pilate cannot be discussed in detail here. In a recent article⁶⁰ the present author has dealt with them from a slightly different angle. The discussion with Pilate in XVIII, 28-38 (essentially an expansion of the story also preserved in the Synoptics) centers around the question of the true nature of Jesus' kingship. It is expressed in terms of testimony to the truth. This is an implicit reference to Jesus' being the Son of God (see III, 31-36 and X, 22-38). This scene is followed by references by Pilate to "the king of the Jews" (XVIII, 39; XIX 14 and 15) and mockery by the soldiers (XIX, 3). The titulus on the cross reads Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. It is said to have been written in three languages and many Jews read it. After protests by the Jewish high priests Pilate refuses to change it (XIX, 19-22). The political implications of the term "king", explicitly denied by Jesus in XVIII, 36, are brought out very clearly in the discussion between Pilate and the Jews in XIX, 12-16.

The title χριστός does not enter into the picture at all. At this point in his gospel John has already clarified its meaning sufficiently, mostly in debates between Jesus and the Jews. The title υἱὸς θεοῦ is, however, brought into the discussion by the Jews rather unexpectedly in XIX, 7 (referring back to the very "essential" debates in V, 18-47 and X, 22-39). The remark by the Jews leads to a second conversation between Jesus and Pilate in XIX, 8-11 with πόθεν εἶ σύ as central question — in fact already answered in the first discussion with the words οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν.

58. See n. 48 above.

59. B. M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, ad loc. considers it an addition to Luke of a logion "of dominical origin".

60. M. DE JONGE, *Jesus as Prophet and King in the Fourth Gospel*, ETL 49 (1973), 160-177, esp. p. 175-177.

Whatever his sources may have been John adapted his material so thoroughly that it could serve his own theological purpose. It is evident that in the Fourth Gospel "Son of God" and "Son" are the most important titles, and that also the title "Christ" is explained in terms of divine sonship⁶¹. John's treatment of the scene(s) before Pilate shows that in the tradition before him Jesus' kingship was an important issue and needed explanation. John gives this explanation in terms of witnessing to the truth (XVIII, 37 and also XIX, 20). Implicitly in the first discussion with Pilate and explicitly in the second, Jesus acts and speaks as Son of God.

IV. Some conclusions

I. AGAIN : MARK

Reverting to our analysis of the christology of Mark XIV, 53-XV, 47 as part of the whole Gospel, it may be useful to sum up briefly what we have found.

a) Mark presupposes the confession : Jesus is the Christ (Messiah). He emphasizes that this confession divides Christians and Jews. At this point the Jews say definitely and unconditionally no.

b) The title *χριστός* is in need of further explanation. Mark emphasizes Jesus' suffering and death and he makes clear that *ὁ χριστός* is the Son of God ; this latter title is the central designation for Jesus in his Gospel.

c) In X, 46-XII, 44 Mark tries to explain, how Jesus the Messiah acts as Son of David. There is a clear distinction between his healing, his concern for the temple and his teaching with authority during his earthly life and the enthronisation (predicted in Psalm CX, 1 and announced in XII, 36 and XIV, 62) leading to his return in royal power and glory, to judge his adversaries. In this context XV, 1-27, using the *βασιλεύς*-title for Jesus which is not found elsewhere in the Gospel, serves to emphasize that Jesus though crucified as "king of the Jews" was totally different from Barabbas and other *στασιασταί*.

d) Mark XIV, 55-65 was shown to be entirely in keeping with the rest of Mark. Jesus' affirmative answer to the question of the High Priest and the announcement of his coming in power and glory form the culminating point in the christological exposition of the Gospel.

61. On this see M. DE JONGE, *Jewish expectations about the "Messiah" according to the Fourth Gospel*, NTS 19 (1972-73), 246-270.

In order to incorporate the line of argument presented by Mark XV, 1-27 into that christological exposition, however, it was necessary to take up some points from Mark XIV, 55-65 in XV, 29-32 and to establish a connection between the titles *ὁ χριστός* and *ὁ βασιλεύς*. It was obviously important for Mark that he could end with the centurion's confession centering around the title *υἱὸς θεοῦ* in Mark XV, 39.

In all this Mark does not explain why the title *χριστός* was used; he simply wants to show how it should be understood by the members of the Christian communities for which his gospel was written. Matthew's and Luke's use of *χριστός* in the Passion narratives is not essentially different from that in Mark. There is the same connection between *χριστός* and *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* (particularly emphasized in Matthew). The connection between *χριστός* and "king" is made more clearly and easily than in Mark; each in his own way, Matthew and Luke try to incorporate the scene before Pilate and the subsequent events leading to the crucifixion into the rest of the story in a more organical way.

2. BEFORE MARK

If Mark and the other Synoptic Gospels presuppose the use of the designation *χριστός* in early Christianity and assign to it an important place in the story of Jesus' condemnation and crucifixion, but do not explain *why* it was used, we should ask whether earlier material preserved in Mark can shed some light on the problems which concern us.

Here we meet an important difficulty. It is generally agreed that there existed a passion narrative before Mark which was used by him, but there is no agreement as to its form and actual contents⁶². In order to arrive at that earlier narrative — or possibly a collection of originally independent narratives — one generally starts from two presuppositions, which are later on reflected in the conclusions. First, that one should try to construct a shorter and more consistent narrative (or narratives) by leaving out everything that does not seem to be entirely in agreement with the surroundings (always according to the standards of Western scholarship). This "easier" story is then considered to be original, and often regarded as representing a more historical view on what happened⁶³. Secondly it is assumed that at an earlier stage christology

62. See e.g. R. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen, 1964, p. 297-302; G. SCHNEIDER, *Verleugnung, Verspottung und Verhör Jesu nach Lukas 22, 54-71* (SANT 22), München, 1969, p. 25f. and J. GNILKA, *op. cit.* (see n. 14 above), p. 9.

63. E. LINNEMANN, *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte* (FRLANT 102), 1970 denies the existence of a coherent pre-Markan narrative and strongly criticizes those scholars who try to give a more original or historical story. In her view there were

tended to be implicit rather than explicit and that, therefore, the christologically less explicit parts are more likely to be original than the other ones.

Both presuppositions can easily be shown to be present, for instance, in F. Hahn's reconstruction of the narrative behind Mark XIV and XV⁶⁴. In his view the oldest story was governed by the principle of fulfilment of Scripture, because it tried to show why everything happened as it, in fact, happened. Materially, no Jewish conceptions concerning future mediators of God's salvation played any rôle; Jesus was portrayed as a suffering righteous man, but this portrait represented an "ideal of piety" rather than a christological conception. In Hahn's view Mark XIV, 55-64 is secondary (others have tried to preserve an older nucleus of the story, leaving out only vv. 61, 62). As to the Pilate-story Hahn assumes that this is an expansion of an earlier narrative which must have consisted of Mark XV, 1, 3-5, 15b, 20b-24, 26f., 29a, 32b., 34, (35f.), 37. The present story wants to show that Jesus, who was crucified as king of the Jews, was indeed king in a special sense of that word, and therefore gives this point extra-emphasis in v. 2, vv. 6-15a and vv. 16-20. Hahn assumes, without any further proof, that v. 26 does not only belong to the oldest form of the story, but even presents a historical fact. This conclusion seems to be unwarranted. There is no reason to doubt that Jesus was crucified and that he was sentenced to death because the Romans regarded him as a dangerous political rebel. But we cannot take for granted that the actual accusation "King of the Jews" was used at the trial before the Roman governor.

It is true that also in the view defended above under II, 3 Mark XV, 1-27 is (in some form or another) older than Mark. This does not make this story more original or more historical; the only thing which is clear is that it originated in circles which wanted to emphasize and to explain Jesus' royal authority and did so in bringing out the differences between Jesus and the actual rebels against the Roman government in

only a number of mainly kerygmatic pieces of narrative, which Mark could use for his passion narrative. These bits and pieces are reconstructed with the help of the methods of the earlier literary critics. So many inconsistencies are found and solved by dissecting the various narratives that one wonders why redactors did not notice what seems evident for a modern scholar. Comp. also J. SCHREIBER, *Theologie des Vertrauens. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Markus-evangeliums*, Hamburg, 1967 and IDEM, *Die Markusp passion. Wege zur Erforschung der Leidensgeschichte Jesu*, Hamburg, 1969.

64. *Op. cit.*, p. 193-196 going back a.o. to M. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Tübingen, 1966, p. 178-218, esp. p. 187. "Das eigentliche Anliegen schon des ältesten Berichtes ist also nicht die Berichterstattung, sondern die Verkündigung dessen was von Gott aus in der Passion geschehen ist. Diesem Zweck dient die Motivierung im Alten Testament, die gewiss schon den alten Bericht durchzog und in dem des Markus ein wesentliches Element wurde."

Palestine⁶⁵. The connection between this emphasis on royal authority and the confession of Jesus as the Christ does not seem clear.

During the seminar there was no time to go into these matters more deeply; it was remarked, however, that regardless of the solutions proposed for the problems connected with the reconstruction of the pre-Markan passion narratives or of a collection of individual stories, the investigation carried out in part II had provided some indications as to the material used by Mark. The following points may be mentioned :

a. It is possible that, originally, the narrative of Peter's denial and the account of Jesus' hearing before the Sanhedrin were unconnected. The contrast Jesus-Peter is brought out by Mark's composition.

b. It is possible that the story of the mockery in XIV, 65, given by Luke in a different place, was originally independent. We should note that here Jesus is, mockingly, addressed as *prophet*.

c. The connection between XIV 58-59 and 61-62 is clearly Markan, because it constitutes an important element in Mark's view on Jesus the Messiah as the "Solomonic" Son of David. Vv. 58-59 may go back to an original independent logion. It proved important that in X, 46-XII, 44 Jesus' activity (in Jericho and) in Jerusalem is portrayed first of all as healing and teaching, connected with the temple and that, at the same time, his authority could be compared to that of a prophet (and of more than a prophet). We noted that also in Mark VIII, 27-30 there was at the same time a connection and an essential distinction between the conception of Jesus as a prophet and the confession of Jesus as the Christ.

Considering (b) and (c) it seems wise to go further along the lines suggested by K. Berger in the two articles which were quoted frequently. Jesus the charismatic teacher and preacher, led by the Spirit, could be portrayed both as an anointed prophet and as a wise king, concerned about the right teaching of God's message and true worship. This seems to provide a possible explanation of the use of *χριστός* which Mark presupposes and of the elements which he uses in his own christological exposition.

d. It also explains the use of the accusation of *βλασφημία* in XIV, 63 (and elsewhere in Mark).

In this connection it is useful to look for a moment at I Cor. I, 18-31, where Paul (in accordance with prepauline tradition) uses the term *χριστός* together with *κηρύσσω* (v. 23), *κήρυγμα* (v. 21), *λόγος* (v. 18). In

65. See also K. BERGER, *Die königlichen Messias Traditionen*, p. 33-35, for Hellenistic-Jewish ideas concerning the wise man as king.

emphasizing that Jesus ὁ χριστός was crucified he does not mention any difficulty or dispute on Jesus' "unroyal" appearance, but he speaks in terms of *μωρία-σοφία*, and *ἀσθένεια-δύναμις* (with *σημεῖα* as an effect). It requires faith, both from Jews and Greeks, to perceive God's power and wisdom in the crucified Messiah Jesus whom the *γραμματεῖς* and *σοφοί* of this world can only regard as weak and foolish.

Again in accordance with prepauline tradition Paul uses the term when speaking about Jesus' death; the emphasis on the cross is his own. In explaining what is at stake he points to the fact that the wisdom and power of this *χριστός* are not visible for everybody, and are, therefore, denied by unbelieving outsiders⁶⁶. When Paul speaks about Christ's *βασιλεύειν* he means his future kingship (I Cor. XV, 24-25, reference to Ps. CX, 1). This is not a central point in his christology⁶⁷, he rather takes it over as a traditional element and nowhere, again, does he indicate that it was a special issue in the debate with the Jews. The parallels here between Paul and Mark are obvious.

3. FURTHER EARLY MATERIAL NOT ANALYSED

It is obvious that also in the other gospels early, non-pre-Markan material may have been preserved. Matthew follows Mark rather closely, and in the pericopes discussed in this paper the differences between Matthew and Mark are largely to be explained as result of redactional activity on the part of Matthew.

More promising seems to be the case of Luke. Much attention has been devoted lately to the special elements in the Lukan Passion Narrative and, particularly, to the question of a special Lukan Passion Source⁶⁸.

Whether one accepts such a source or not one will have to consider the possibility that Luke had recourse to independent tradition and that not all divergencies from Mark are to be explained as results of thorough-going free redactional activity on the part of Luke. The seminar did not go into the many problems presented by the Third Gospel. Nor did it deal with the specific situation of the Fourth Gospel. It was not determined what additional early material was used by John, nor was the question

66. See K. BERGER, *Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund*, p. 398f.

67. Negatively: I Cor. IV, 8 (presupposing the *συμβασιλεύειν* of Christians with Christ in the future), comp. II Tim. II, 11-13; Rev. V, 10; XX, 4, 6; XXII, 5. See also Eph. V, 5; Col I, 13; Hebr I, 8; II Tim. IV, 1 and 18.

68. See A. WIKENHAUSER-J. SCHMID, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Freiburg-Basel-Wien, 1973, p. 259-260; G. SCHNEIDER, *op. cit.* (see n. 62 above); D. R. CATCHPOLE, *op. cit.* (see n. 51 above); V. TAYLOR, *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke* (S.N.T.S. Mon. Ser. 19), Cambridge 1972.

discussed whether he used the other three Gospels (particularly Mark and Luke) or independent tradition similar to that preserved there ⁶⁹.

Looking back it becomes clear that much was disregarded ; concentration on the specific problems of Mark yielded some results, however, that call for further investigation along the lines suggested. In this respect, it is hoped, the seminar may have proved useful as a stimulus to further study.

69. See W. G. KÜMMEL, *Einleitung*, p. 167-170.

THE USE OF THE EXPRESSION Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ IN THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN

1. Introduction

The expression *ὁ χριστός* is found four times in the Apocalypse, in three passages. First in 11, 15 where after the blowing of the seventh trumpet loud voices are heard in heaven, saying : „ The sovereignty of the world has passed to our Lord and his Anointed, and he will reign for ever and ever '. Secondly in 12, 10 where, after the dragon has been thrown down on earth, a loud voice in heaven says : “ Now the salvation, power and sovereignty of God, and the authority of his Anointed have come ”. And thirdly in 20, 4 and 6 where, in the period of one thousand years during which Satan is bound in the abyss, those who have remained faithful are said to reign with the Anointed One (v. 4) as priests of God and the Anointed One (v. 6).

In all these cases *ὁ χριστός* is used in close connection with *ὁ κυριός* (used of God) and *ὁ θεός*. Also in all three passages the word is used together with the noun *βασιλεία* and/or the verb *βασιλεύω*. The Anointed One reigns with God (11, 15 ; 12, 10) and the faithful reign with him. In *ὁ χριστός αὐτοῦ* of the first two passages *ὁ χριστός* is clearly used as a title. As has often been remarked ¹ the expression the Anointed One of the Lord (or of God) does not occur very often in the New Testament (in Lk 2, 26 ; 9, 20 ; 23, 35 ; Acts 3, 18 ; 4, 26) but it is a regular designation for the king of Israel in the Old Testament (e.g. in Ps 2, 2 ; 18, 51 ; 20, 7 ; 28, 8 ; 83, 10 ; 89, 39.52 ; 132, 10.17) and it is used to denote the future ideal king in Ps Sol 17, 32 ; 18 superscriptio. 5.7 ; I En 48, 10 ; 52, 4 ; syr Bar 39, 7 ; 40, 1 ; 72, 2. In syr Bar and IV Ezra we find “ the Anointed One ” (IV Ezra 12, 32, perhaps 7, 29 ; syr Bar 29, 3 ; 30, 1 ; 70, 9), in the case of syr Bar side by side with “ my Anointed One ”. Something similar is found in the Apoca-

1. See e.g. T. HOLTZ, *Die Christologie der Apokalypse des Johannes* (TU, 85), Berlin, 1962 (²1971), pp. 5-9 ; J. COMBLIN, *Le Christ dans l'Apocalypse*, Tournai, 1965, pp. 177-179. On the pseudepigrapha see M. DE JONGE, in *TWNT*, IX, pp. 502-508.

lypse where ὁ χριστός without αὐτοῦ is found in 20, 4 and 6. Here, however, the transition to the use of χριστός as one of the names for Jesus seems to be fluid. The 25th edition of Nestle which has χριστοῦ in 11, 15 and 12, 10 prints Χριστοῦ in 20, 4 and 6².

The Apocalypse, of course, also uses χριστός three times (1, 2.3.5.)³ in the expression Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, which functions as a proper name. In the Apocalypse in its present form there is only one Anointed One : Jesus who died and was exalted to heaven, and who will return in future.

The book uses Jesus Christ as a double name and yet is aware of the functional meaning of χριστός. Can we find out why this designation is used in the three passages just mentioned and what is expressed with it ? To answer these questions we shall have to take a closer look at the context of the passages concerned and to examine a few parallel passages ; next we shall have to ask what earlier traditions may have been taken over and adapted by the author of the Apocalypse.

2. The First Passage : 11, 15-19

The proclamation of the loud voices (whose they are is not specified) in 11, 15 is followed in vv. 17-18 by a thanksgiving hymn of the twenty-four elders, seated on their thrones before God (cf. 4, 10), which may be taken as a commentary on v. 15. It follows on the blowing of the seventh trumpet, while the thanksgiving hymn of the elders is followed by the revelation of the ark of God's covenant standing in God's temple in heaven, accompanied by flashes of lightning and peals of thunder, an earthquake and a storm of hail (v. 19). In chapter 12 clearly a new section of the Apocalypse begins.

For the purpose of this paper there is no need to enter into a detailed discussion of the composition and structure of the Apocalypse. I found E. Schüssler Fiorenza's recent article *Composition and Structure of the Book of Revelation*⁴ most helpful and also learnt a number of things from the first chapter of A. Yarbro Collins' book *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*⁵. All will agree, I suppose, that the proclamation of 11, 15 (and, in fact, the whole passage 11, 15-19) occupies a strategic place in the

2. GNT³ uses capital letters in all four texts.

3. J. COMBLIN, *Le Christ dans l'Apocalypse*, Tournai, p. 177, adds the final benediction 22, 21 where Χριστοῦ is added after Ἰησοῦ in a number of witnesses (a.o. the Koine-text and the Vulgate).

4. In *CBQ* 39 (1977) 344-366.

5. (Harvard Dissertations in Religion, 9), Missoula, 1976, especially chapter I "The Structure of the Book of Revelation", pp. 5-55. See now also J. LAMBRECHT's contribution to the present volume *A Structuration of Revelation 4:1-22:5* (pp. 77-104 above).

structure of the Apocalypse. The angel blows the seventh, and last, trumpet. Nothing happens; there is a certain resemblance with the seventh seal: After the opening of the seventh seal there is a silence of what seems like a half hour before seven trumpets are given to seven angels (8, 1.2.6) ⁶. After the seventh trumpet, however, there is no such sequel. The heavenly voices proclaim that the sovereignty of the world has now passed over to the Lord and his Anointed; he (= God!) shall reign for ever and ever. And the elders give thanks for the fact that the final judgment has come. The revelation of the ark emphasizes that God is faithful to his covenant: "God has pledged himself to the fulfilment of all the great deeds celebrated in the heavenly song just sung" (Charles) ⁷.

At the end of the Book of Seals God's final intervention is announced and acclaimed, but not yet described. In the meantime a second book — open, this time — has already been given to the seer (chapter 10) ⁸ and vision after vision follows until only in 19, 11 ff is God's final intervention really described.

Some more detailed remarks on vv. 15.17-18 are in order ⁹: First we should note that the seventh trumpet is announced in 10, 6-7 with the words: "There will be no more delay; but when the seventh angel blows his trumpet, then God will accomplish his secret plan as he announced it to his servants, the prophets" (T.E.V.). Important is the phrase *χρόνος οὐκ ἐστὶν*

6. After the pouring out of the seventh bowl (16, 17) a loud voice from the throne says: "It is done" (γέγονεν). Flashes of lightning, peals of thunder and a violent earthquake follow, as in 11, 19, but here their effect is described: vv. 19-21 give an introduction to the destruction of Babylon, to be dealt with at great length in the next chapter.

7. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, (ICC), I, Edinburgh, 1920, p. 297. See also K.P. Jörens's study mentioned in note 9 for the O.T. elements in this verse. He concludes: "Das Erscheinen der Lade und die sie begleitenden Ereignisse sind Symbole der letzten Theophanie, die nun begonnen hat" (p. 107).

8. See E. SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, *Composition and Structure*, on "the method of intercalation": "10:1-11:14 serves in the author's mind as an introduction to the following section, chaps. 12-14" (p. 361). 11, 15-19 serves as the ending of 4, 1-9, 21. In Fiorenza's view 10, 1-15, 4 forms the central part of the book. A similar theory is found in A. Yarbro Collins' book (see note 5); she speaks of "the technique of interlocking" and finds that also applied in chapters 10-11. She puts more emphasis on the two scrolls as an organizing principle in the Apocalypse. She attributes 5, 1-11, 19 to the Scroll with the Seven Seals, and 12, 1-22, 5 to the Little Scroll mentioned in chapter 10. I quote from p. 43: "The relationship between the two great cycles of visions is thus characterized by the fact that each of the major recurring elements is sketched in the first cycle and then more fully described in the second. It does not thus seem to be accidental that the sealed scroll characterizes the earlier visions, while an open scroll introduces the later series". For a different approach see J. Lambrecht, in his article in the present volume, particularly pp. 96-97.100-102.

9. On this see also K.P. JÖRNS, *Das hymnische Evangelium. Untersuchungen zu Aufbau, Funktion und Herkunft der hymnischen Stücke in der Johannesoffenbarung* (SNT, 5), Gütersloh, 1971, pp. 90-108.

ἔσται after the announcement to the souls of the martyrs in 6, 9-11 that they have to rest ἕτι χρόνος μικρός, "until the total number was reached of their fellow servants and brothers who were to be killed as they had been" (T.E.V.). At the blowing of the seventh trumpet the end will have come: ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (in which μυστήριον refers to "the whole purpose of God with regard to the world" (Charles¹⁰).

In v. 15 all emphasis is on ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κοσμοῦ now belonging to the Lord and his Anointed. In fact they rule together. In the last clause of this verse καὶ βασιλεύσει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, the verb is in the singular¹¹, and in v. 17 only God's sovereignty is mentioned: God is addressed as κύριος and παντοκράτωρ, who has taken his great power into his hands and has begun to reign (cf. Ps 92, 1 LXX)¹². God's "kingship" is also mentioned in other passages (12, 10; 15, 3; 19, 6, cf. v. 2), as is that of Jesus Christ, who is called ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς in 1, 5, and, in connection with the victory of the Lamb, βασιλεὺς βασιλέων (17, 14), a name which is also written on the robe and the thigh of the rider on the white horse in 19, 16¹³. We should also note that three passages connect Jesus Christ with David. In 5, 5 the Lamb which is allowed to open the book and its seven seals is called "the lion from the tribe of Judah" and "the scion of David"; the latter designation also occurs in 22, 16 "the scion and offspring of David"¹⁴.

In v. 17 we find the divine predicate ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν, which is also found in 1, 4, 8; 4, 8 and 16, 5; here and in 16, 5 the additional clause ὁ ἐρχόμενος found in 1, 4, 8; 4, 8 is omitted, no doubt because it no longer applies.

The influence of Ps 2, already noticeable in v. 15, referring to v. 2 of the psalm, is evident in the first phrase of v. 18 καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὠργίσθησαν καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ ὀργὴ σου which follows on the mention of God's sovereignty¹⁵.

Next follows a reference to the judgment of the dead, two aspects of which are mentioned. Those who serve God will receive their reward, those who destroy the earth will be destroyed. Those who serve God are designated as "your servants", "the prophets", "the holy ones" and "those who fear your name", and it is not clear how these designations are connected. For the purpose of this paper it is sufficient to note that — also by

10. *Commentary*, I, p. 265. See also R.E. BROWN, *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament*, Philadelphia, 1968, p. 38.

11. Cf. Ex 15, 18; Ps 10, 16; 146, 10; Zech 14, 9; Dan 2, 44; Wis 3, 8.

12. And some further passages in the Book of Psalms speaking about the Lord who becomes king (see K.P. JÖRNS, *Das hymnische Evangelium*, p. 103).

13. In both places together with κύριος κυρίων; cf. 1 En 9, 4 (Synecellus).

14. See also the expression "the key of David" in 3, 7 probably to be connected with "the keys of death and Hades" in 1, 18.

15. See Ps 2, 1-2.5.12, but also Ps 99, 1.

means of the closing phrase "both great and small" — all believers are taken together in such a way that the prophets have pride of place¹⁶.

In conclusion I would like to stress that all elements referred to in the thanksgiving hymn are mentioned later on in the Apocalypse, but not in the same order and sometimes in a different way. This will be evident as we turn to the next two passages which concern us.

3. The Second Passage : 12, 10-12

Chapter 12 begins with two much-debated narratives, one describing a dragon's attack on a woman and her child (vv. 1-6), and one describing a war in heaven between Michael and his angels and the dragon — now also designated as the Old Serpent, the Devil and Satan. However complicated the prehistory of the chapter will have been — again there is no need to go into the many problems presented by the chapter and the solutions proposed for them¹⁷ — it is clear that the Hymn of Victory¹⁸ found in vv. 10-12 is a redactional passage, bringing out the meaning of the narratives in the context of the Apocalypse as a whole.

In 12, 5 two important facts stand out. The son born to the woman is the one "who will rule (ποιμαίνειν) all the nations with an iron rod". The phrase recurs in 19, 5¹⁹ when the rider on the white horse with the heavenly hosts is about to begin the final battle. Again Psalm 2, this time vv. 8 and 9, is in the background²⁰. The son, who is to be the ruler of the future, is now before God's throne, like the Lamb in the earlier chapters (5, 5-6.13,

16. There are many difficulties: δοῦλοι can be connected with prophets in particular (so 10, 7!), but also denotes God's servants in general (19, 2.5 etc). Because of 19, 5 we may think that in v. 18 it is used as a general term; this same verse seems to suggest that the καὶ before τοῖς φοβουμένοις (omitted by some witnesses) should be taken as a καὶ epexegeticum. This leaves us with the two terms τοῖς προφήταις καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις in the middle — cf. 16, 6; 18, 20.24. For "both great and small" see also 13, 16; 19, 5.18; 20, 2. On the terms used here see A. SATAKE, *Die Gemeindeordnung in der Johannesapokalypse* (WMANT, 21), Neukirchen, 1966, about our text esp. p. 39.

17. See e.g. the monograph of A. YARBRO COLLINS mentioned in note 5.

18. This phrase is used by K.P. JÖRNS, *Das hymnische Evangelium*, pp. 110-120, and A. YARBRO COLLINS, *The Combat Myth*, pp. 136-138. ἡ σωτηρία comes first also in 7, 10 and 19, 1. W. BAUER calls it a Hebraism (*Wörterbuch*, s.v., col. 1587); on the O.T. and Jewish background see K.P. JÖRNS, *ibid.*, pp. 80-82 on 7, 10: "das Wort meint ein spezifisches Heil, nämlich den durch Gott und das Lamm für die Erlösten erkämpften eschatologischen Sieg".

19. See also 2, 26 where the individual who "is victorious and continues to do my works until the end" is said to receive the authority over the nations to rule them with an iron rod and to break them into pieces like clay pots" — an authority that Jesus Christ has received from his father.

20. In the interpretation of the LXX which reads *terō' ēm* as *tir' em* = ποιμανεῖς,

cf. 7, 9.10.17). The future ruler is near God and the dragon has no hold on him.

The story of Satan's expulsion from heaven emphasizes this ; and at the same time, it tries to explain why, on earth, the dragon persecutes " those who obey God's commandments and keep the testimony of Jesus " (12, 17). Persecution is a very important aspect of the life of the churches for which John is writing. This is clear in all parts of the book, but in chapters 12-13 this persecution is placed within the framework of a cosmic conflict and, at the same time, the " zeitgeschichtliche " elements are more prominent (cf. also chapters 17-18).

The hymn in vv. 10-12 connects God's victory leading to his taking up sovereignty and power, and implying the authority of his Anointed, with the fact that Satan has been thrown from heaven. Satan's role as accuser in the heavenly court (not mentioned in vv. 7-9, but well-known from the Old Testament and Jewish writings²¹) has come to an end. The emphasis on the judicial activity of Satan may be explained²² by the fact that v. 11 indirectly brings earthly courts to mind. The loud voice²³ hails the victory of " our brethren " (v. 10) because of " the blood of the Lamb and their word of testimony " that is of those who " were willing to give their lives and die " (T.E.V. translation of οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἕχαρι θανάτου). Persecution, testimony in courts and other places, and martyrdom are hard realities. Those who remain faithful unto death, may share in the victory of the Lamb, who, himself, gave his life, and they may be assured that no accuser is left in heaven to make things difficult for them.

Like 11, 15-19, this passage sings of the final victory of God and his Anointed, in which the faithful may share. Yet, the emphasis is, on the one hand, on what has already happened (see v. 5 and vv. 7-8) and, on the other, on the fact that the end is not yet (v. 12 !). The heavens and those who dwell in heaven may rejoice²⁴, but woe to earth and the sea, where the devil now rages²⁵, knowing that his time is short (ὅτι ὀλίγον καιρὸν ἔχει). The victory of the martyrs is assured, but nevertheless martyrdom is

21. See e.g. Job 1-2 ; Zech 3 ; 1 En 40, 7 ; cf. A. YARBRO COLLINS, *The Combat Myth*, pp. 138-141, who also makes some remarks on the connection between military and judicial conflict in other sources (Jub 48 ; 1 En 90, 20-27 ; 11 Q Melch).

22. So A. YARBRO COLLINS, *The Combat Myth*, pp. 141 f.

23. Because of the reference to " our brethren " in v. 10 one often thinks that the souls of the martyrs mentioned in 6, 9-11 are speaking here. We cannot exclude, however, that angels are meant, showing their solidarity with the faithful witnesses on earth (see 19, 10 ; 22, 9 where σύνδουλος is used which occurs as a parallel to ἀδελφός in 6, 11) — so T. HOLTZ, *Die Christologie* (see note 1), pp. 95-96.

24. See also 18, 20 ; cf. Dt 32, 43 (LXX) ; Is 44, 23 ; 49, 13 ; Ps 69, 35 ; 96, 11 (1 Chr 16, 31) — see A. SATAKE, *Die Gemeindeordnung* (see note 16), pp. 54-56, who rightly stresses that in the O.T. parallels " heaven and earth " (plus, sometimes, also the sea) are called upon to rejoice together.

25. In v. 10 God's sovereignty is not connected with the kosmos (as in 11, 15).

a grim reality on earth. In 6, 9-11 those who have already given their lives, and have already received a white robe (cf. 3, 5), were told to rest $\epsilon\tau\iota\ \chi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\ \mu\iota\kappa\rho\acute{o}\nu$, until the number of martyrs is complete. 12, 10-12 combines the "already" with the "not yet" in another way; while 6, 11a speaks about the fate of the individual martyrs, 12, 10-12, at least primarily ²⁶, envisages the final victory of all martyrs collectively: the end is not yet, but it is near; it will come after a very short interregnum ²⁷ of Satan and his companions.

No matter how much repetition there is in the Apocalypse, "the author" — in the words of E. Schüssler Fiorenza — "combines a cyclic form of repetition with the end-oriented movement of the whole book". As the same author remarks: "The forward thrust of the narrative is also interrupted through the *interludes*. They are visions or hymns of eschatological protection and salvation (e.g. 7:1-17; 11:15-19; 12:10; 14:1-5; 15:2-4; 19:1-9; 20:4-6)". Her explanation is important: "Insofar as the author interrupts the pattern of continuous narrative and cyclic repetition through the insertion of these anticipatory visions and auditions, he expresses in his composition the relationship between the present reality and the eschatological future" ²⁸.

Before we turn to our last passage, 20, 4-6, in this perspective, we have to make a few additional remarks on 12, 11, the central verse of this hymn. The verb νικάω is used several times in connection with the members of the Christian communities, but nearly always in the present participle: 2, 7.11.17.26.; 3, 5.12.21; 21, 7. Even in 15, 2 which describes the future victory the (difficult) expression τοὺς νικῶντας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου κτλ is used. The meaning of ὁ νικῶν is clearly: he who perseveres until he is victorious in the battle against the forces of evil. The aorist indicative is used in connection with Jesus Christ; so in 3, 21 ὁ νικῶν, δώσω αὐτῷ καθίσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ μου, ὡς κἀγὼ ἐνίκησα καὶ ἐκάθισα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ. This should be connected with 5, 5 ἰδοὺ ἐνίκησεν ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰουδα. This lion is the ἀρνίον... ὡς ἐσφαγμένον mentioned in the next verse. Of this lamb it is said that he is victorious and will be victorious (17, 14). There seems to be a particularly close connection between 12, 11 and 5, 5 ff. The victory is gained because of ²⁹ the

26. 12, 11 *can* be read in the perspective of 6, 11. Those who have remained faithful unto death will receive their white robe; at the time of death one may be sure of victory — cf. 7, 1-8 and 9-17.

27. In v. 14 it is connected with the "time and times and half a time" of Dan 7, 25 and 12, 7 (cf. the 1260 days in v. 6).

28. The quotations are from p. 360 in her article "Composition and Structure" (see note 4).

29. As to διὰ plus the accusative BLASS-DEBRUNNER-REHKOPF, § 222³, thinks that it means "in virtue of" in 12, 11 as well as in 13, 14. W. BAUER, s.v., B II 4a, chooses, however, for the translation "through" (like διὰ plus gen.).

blood of the lamb and their word of testimony. The first expression is also found in 7, 14 (cf. 1, 5; 5, 9) and emphasizes that the lamb who was slaughtered and is victorious gives salvation to those who belong to him³⁰. In the expression διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν it is not clear whether it should be translated "the testimony which they uttered" (so N.E.B. text) or "the word of God to which they bore witness" (N.E.B. apparatus). In view of the expression τὸν λόγον θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ found in 1, 2.9; 20, 4 (cf. 6, 9; 12, 17; 19, 10) where the emphasis clearly is on the word of God and the testimony of Jesus³¹ I tend to prefer the second translation. The subjective element is clearly underlined in the last phrase of the verse, which is reminiscent of the texts on the following of Christ in the gospels, particularly John 12, 25 f.

4. The Third Passage : 20, 4-6³²

The final visions of judgment and salvation begin with the vision of the rider on the white horse, who judges and fights the final battle with justice (19, 11). We have already noticed that — among many other things — it is said that he will rule the nations with an iron rod (v. 15) and that his name is "King of kings and Lord of lords" (v. 16).

In a series of visions (seven times καὶ εἶδον : 19, 11.17.19; 20, 1.4.11; 21, 1!) the various aspects of final judgment, punishment and salvation are reviewed. The dragon, the beast and the pseudo-prophet, which came onto the scene in chapters 12 and 13 are punished, first the beast and the false prophet with all those who have received the mark of the beast and worshipped his image (vv. 17-21). Next the dragon who bears the same names

30. Compare particularly 5, 9-10, concerning which see E. SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, *Priester für Gott. Studien zum Herrschafts- und Priestermotiv in der Apokalypse* (NTA, NF, 7), Münster, 1972, p. 279: "Der gewaltsame Tod des Christus, der in Apk 5 als davidischer Messias König und Opferlamm zugleich gesehen wird, begründet seine eschatologische Weltherrschaft. ...Diese Übernahme der eschatologischen Herrschaft durch das Lamm wird aber in Apk 5, 9 f nicht nur durch seinen Opfertod begründet sondern auch durch die Schaffung des neuen Gottesvolkes..."

31. See e.g. CHARLES, *Commentary I*, p. 7 (on 1, 2): "The revelation given by God and borne witness to by Christ... It means the Christian revelation as a whole in i.9, vi.9, xx.4..." ; but Charles is not sure whether in some cases (19, 10) Ἰησοῦ may not be the objective genitive.

32. See E. SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA's monograph *Priester für Gott* mentioned in note 30 together with her articles *Redemption as Liberation : Apoc 1:5f. and 5:9f.*, in *CBQ* 34 (1974) 220-232 and *Die tausendjährige Herrschaft der Auferstandenen (Apk 20, 4-6)*, in *Bibel und Leben* 13 (1972) 107-124. One may consult the survey of recent opinion in O. BÖCHER, *Die Johannesapokalypse* (Erträge der Forschung, 41), Darmstadt, 1975, pp. 96-106. On the millennium see H. BIETENHARD, *Das tausendjährige Reich. Eine biblisch-theologische Studie*, Bern, 1944 (Zürich, 1955).

as in 12, 7-9, is bound by an angel for a thousand years, and thrown into the abyss, which is shut and sealed in order to prevent him from leading the nations astray during those years (20, 1-3). When that period is over Satan is let loose from his prison and manages to seduce the nations in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, and leads them in an assault on the holy ones; they besiege the beloved city but are consumed by fire descending from heaven, and the devil, their seducer, is thrown into the lake of fire and sulphur where the beast and the false prophet are already being tormented day and night for ever (vv. 7-10).

Next follows the final judgment by God. Earth and heaven disappear; there is a general resurrection, all the dead stand before the throne and are judged according to their works recorded in the heavenly books. Death and Hades are thrown into the lake of fire, and everybody whose name is not written in the book of Life is thrown into this lake, too. This is, the author tells us, the second death (vv. 11-15).

Finally, John sees the new heaven and earth and the new Jerusalem "ready like a bride adorned for her husband" which is described at great length (21, 1 ff). There is a great profusion of images, and an effort is made to cover as many aspects of final judgment and salvation as possible. It is difficult to reconcile all the details in the various visions and we should not attempt to make everything agree. It is also not necessary to regard the order of the various visions, which has some logic, as a strictly chronological one.

This is also true of the one episode not yet mentioned, the vision recorded in 20, 4-6 which concerns us especially. In the thousand year period during which the devil is bound in the abyss (vv. 4.5.6.; cf. 2.3.7) those who have been faithful to the end come to life and reign with the Anointed One. It is good to note that this category of servants of God and Jesus is singled out for special mention. The period of waiting, announced in 6, 9-11 is over, the promise that the men of every tribe and language, people and nation purchased by the blood of the Lamb, kings and priests, would reign upon the earth (5, 9-10) has become true. The hour of victory (12, 11) is really and fully there, the short interregnum of the dragon (12, 12) has come to an end. The fate of those who did not worship the beast stands in clear contrast to that of the followers of the beast and the pseudo-prophet mentioned in 19, 17-21. They receive life, and are said to take part in the first resurrection, preceding the general resurrection mentioned in 20, 11-15, and this life is characterized as "reigning with the Anointed One" (twice, in v. 4 and v. 6). Nothing is said about the end of the period, except that in v. 9 (in the next pericope which is not introduced by a new καὶ εἶδον!) the holy ones are described as being immune to the final attack of Satan and his followers on the beloved city. No further activity of the Anointed One is recorded. Even in vv. 4-6 his reign is only mentioned by implication (and, in fact, also in 19, 11-21 where the active role of the rider

on the white horse is stressed, there is a preference for passive constructions !). The author of the Apocalypse clearly wants his readers to believe that the Anointed One and all those who share the life and rule of the thousand years at the general resurrection are joined by those among "the rest of the dead who did not come to life until the thousand years came to an end" (v. 5) whose names are found to be written in the Book of Life.

In short : 20, 4-6 speaks about a special group of people who receive a special reward. It is not different in kind from what others receive (see e.g. 22, 5), but they are to take part in the first resurrection, they are ahead of the others and share in the blessings of the thousand year period which are described in very sober terms.

We shall have to look at some more details before we can draw our final conclusion. Vv. 4-6 consist of the vision proper in v. 4, a macarism in v. 6 and the transitional verse 5. The syntax of v. 4 presents us with many problems, but it is clear that the visionary sees thrones, and people who sit on them ; they are given power to judge. He also sees "the souls of those who had been beheaded because of the testimony of Jesus and the word of God, those who had not worshipped the beast and his image, and had not received the mark of the beast on their foreheads or hands". They all come to life and reign with the Anointed One for a thousand years.

The first half of v. 4 draws upon the imagery of Dan 7, 9.22. It is not specified who sit on the thrones — (God with) angelic beings or the loyal believers in v. 4b. There is also some dispute as to the meaning of *καὶ κρίμα ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς*³³. In any case it is clear that the judgment scene ends with the rehabilitation of those who had to suffer during the reign of the beast and the pseudo-prophet described in chapters 12-14. It is likely that the two characterizations refer to one group of people³⁴. Those who have

33. *καὶ κρίμα ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς* agrees with Dan 7, 22 Theod. If in Daniel *κρίμα* means verdict rather than the act of judgment or the authority to judge, and the expression in 20, 4 means the same, we should take the expression to refer to rehabilitation — cf. 18, 20 (and F. BÜCHSEL's exegesis in *TWNT* III, pp. 843 f). If this is right, there is some point in taking the people mentioned in v. 4b as the subject of *ἐκάθισαν*. We should, then, assume that they do not sit on their thrones to judge (cf. Mt 19, 28 ; Lk 22, 30 ; 1 Cor 6, 2 f) but to reign. E. Schüssler Fiorenza points out that, with the exception of God's throne in 20, 11, thrones are nowhere clearly described as seats of judgment (*Priester für Gott*, p. 304). 3, 21 particularly suggests the interpretation of 20, 4 just given.

34. The part of the sentence beginning with *καὶ οἱ τίνες* is attached very clumsily, yet it is likely that the visionary is supposed to see here also "the souls" of those people. All Christians who remained faithful in their witness to the very end (see on 12, 11), indeed all who in the struggle with the beast refused to worship the beast and to receive his mark (see 13, 16 f ; 14, 9.11 ; 16, 2 ; 19, 20 over against 7, 3 ; 14, 1 ; 22, 4 ; cf 2, 17 ; 3, 12) are meant here. On *ψυχαί* see 6, 9-11 (cf. also 16, 5-7 ; 18, 20). It is not necessary to distinguish between "martyrs" and "confessors" — for the author the entire church of his days is *in statu confessionis* ; he is not writing for (and about) Christians in general but for (and about) a number of persecuted Christian churches in particular.

remained loyal to the very end receive a new life. The ἐξῆσαν of the martyrs refers to resurrection (cf. 2, 8 of Jesus, and 13, 14) — as v. 5 specifies with its mention of the rest of the dead who come to life after the thousand year-period and the use of the term “the first resurrection”, leading over to the macarism in v. 6 concerning those who share in the first resurrection; over them the second death (v. 14!) has no power. In this verse the phrase καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν μετὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ of v. 4 is taken up and expanded: ἔσονται ἱερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν μετ’ αὐτοῦ. This refers back to 1, 6 and 5, 10 and is followed by 22, 5 where the term ἱερεῖς is dropped, when (all) the servants of God are described as worshipping God continuously and seeing him face to face; the Lord God will give them light, and they will be reigning forevermore. E. Schüssler Fiorenza has dealt with these four texts at great length in her monograph and shown that there is a progression in thought in them: In 1, 6 traditional baptismal terms are used to maintain that Jesus Christ installed the redeemed to kingship, to priests for God, his father. In 5, 10 an antagonistic-ethical as well as an eschatological understanding of redemption is implied. One should note the emphasis on concrete reign in the additional phrase καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. In 20, 4 the noun βασιλεία is not used at all; only the verb occurs twice, indicating the active participation of the faithful in the reign of the Anointed One. The faithful continue to be called “priests” (of God and the Anointed One). In Fiorenza’s view this is, because sharing in God’s reign over the world presupposes true worship over against the adoration of the beast (cf. v. 4b). In 22, 3-5, finally, the eternal reign of all God’s servants is mentioned in analogy to that of God and his Anointed in 11, 15. It is connected with a perfect and continuous worship of God; if they see God’s face continually, and have his name on their foreheads, they are all in fact high-priests³⁵.

The passage 20, 4-6 is another “interlude” among the many in the Apocalypse³⁶, and, like the others, it concentrates on the salvation of the faithful believers. It stands in between the two passages dealing with the dragon (vv. 1-3; 7-10) and is, at the same time, closely connected with them (the repeated mention of the thousand years!). The privilege of living and reigning with the Anointed One is clearly restricted to those who have resisted actively in the fierce struggle which is described as the time of

35. *Priester für Gott*, p. 388: “Der eschatologische Gottesdienst der Knechte Gottes ist also nicht durch den Opfer- oder Mittlergedanken bestimmt, sondern findet seine Erfüllung darin, dass die eschatologisch Geretteten als die wahren Hohepriester der Endzeit vor Gott stehen und sein Angesicht schauen dürfen”. Fiorenza’s views on 1, 6 and 5, 10 are well summed up in her article *Redemption as Liberation*; for 20, 6 and 22, 3-5 see *Priester für Gott*, pp. 329-344 and pp. 368-389. One should note that in 22, 3 αὐτοῦ and αὐτῷ are singular but refer to God and the Lamb who have one throne.

36. See p. 273, above.

the raging of the devil who has only very little time left (12, 12). We should see that only in 20, 4-6 is a special period of reign on the renewed earth (cf. v. 9, and, perhaps, 14, 1) by the Anointed One and the faithful mentioned. In the preceding "interlude", 19, 7-8, for instance, a vast crowd announces that the Lord God, sovereign over all, has entered upon his reign and that the wedding-day of the Lamb has come, and in v. 9 a macarism is added for those who are invited to the wedding-meal of the Lamb. This is taken up in the description of the New Jerusalem in 21, 2 and 9, and nothing indicates that there will first be a special period of bliss for a special group of believers. In view of the implied continuity between the millennium and that which takes place after the last judgment it would be fair to say that the author did not wish to stress the differences between the millennium and the period thereafter, but used this concept to emphasize the reward for the persecuted righteous (11, 18 !) and the necessity that the same earth which, for a time, had been under Satan's sway (in chapters 12-18, particularly 12, 12 and 13, 7-8) would now be ruled (on God's behalf) by the Anointed One, together with those who had to suffer but did not yield. God the Almighty who has now fully established his reign in the entire kosmos, has, particularly, shown his sovereignty over the earth. This special emphasis is obviously an integral part of the theology of the author of the Apocalypse himself, no matter how much traditional material was used by him, elsewhere and in the passage 20, 4-6 ³⁷.

5. Conclusion

Our findings may be summed up as follows :

a) ὁ χριστός αὐτοῦ is used in texts dealing with the future, final reign of God and his Anointed (11, 15 ; 12, 10). It is in fact God who takes up sovereignty and power through his Anointed.

b) In 20, 4.6 the emphasis is on the future reign of (a special category of) believers with the Anointed One.

The first two passages as well as the last one play an important part in the Apocalypse, encouraging those who have to suffer under the assault of the dragon and his associates. God's kingdom is near and those who remain faithful and steadfast, even unto death, will share in it. This message presupposes the belief in the redemption wrought by Jesus' death and exaltation. The lion of Judah is victorious, the Lamb that was slaughtered stands near the throne 5, 6 (cf. 7, 9.17 ; 12, 5) and in hymns he who sits on

37. For this conclusion, see again E. SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, particularly pp. 325-332 in her *Priester für Gott*. In looking for Jewish parallels to the views on the millennium found in the Apocalypse she rightly emphasizes the many differences in contrast to eschatological themes known from Jewish sources (pp. 313-325). See also p. 280, below.

the throne and the Lamb are mentioned together (5, 13 ; 7, 10). In 3, 21 those who are victorious receive the promise that they will sit on Jesus Christ's throne, just as he sat down with his father on his throne. Perhaps this is also expressed in 20, 4a³⁸ ; in 22, 1-5 there is only one throne — that of God and the Lamb ; they reign together and are worshipped together by their servants who are said to reign forever themselves.

God's victorious kingdom of the future is a reality for the author of the Apocalypse. In 11, 15 and 12, 10 his diction is clearly influenced by Ps 2, 2 — a psalm which influenced the wording of the book in many other places. Ps 2, 1-2 is actually quoted in Acts 4, 25-26, by Luke, the only other author in the New Testament who uses the expression "the Anointed of the Lord". In Acts, however, the text is connected with the opposition of Herod and Pontius Pilate to Jesus, whom God had anointed, and if J. Comblin is right in supposing that both Luke and the author of the Apocalypse wanted to underline the continuity between their message and that of the prophets by re-using formulations taken from the Old Testament³⁹, we must conclude that they did so in entirely different ways.

The expression "the Anointed of the Lord" is found as a designation of a future ideal king from the family of David in Ps Sol 17 (and 18)⁴⁰. Psalm 2 has left only a few traces (notably Ps 2, 9 in v. 24 !), but we should note that Ps Sol 17 while describing the activity of a future Son of David begins and ends with the glorification of God's eternal sovereignty. In one of the few instances where the word "Anointed" is found in early Jewish literature, 1 En 48, 10, again Ps 2, 1-2 is clearly referred to⁴¹. Other texts speak of the reign of the Anointed One (1 En 52, 4 ; syr Bar 39, 7⁴² ; 40, 3 ; 73, 1), indicating that they, too, think of an anointed king.

Unfortunately, neither IV Ezra nor syr Bar, apocalypses which (in a variety of ways !) speak about a period of the messiah before the final judgment, present us with many specific parallels to Apoc. 20, 4-6. IV Ezra 7, 28 ; 12, 34 (cf. 13, 24.48) speak especially about the survivors (in the land !) who are made joyful in the time of the Anointed One ; according to 7, 29 f everyone, including my Son, the Anointed One, will die before the new aeon begins with a general resurrection. Similar ideas are found in syr

38. See note 33.

39. In *Le Christ dans l'Apocalypse* (see note 1), p. 178.

40. In 17, 32 all MSS read Χριστός κύριος, but the χριστός αὐτοῦ in 18, 5 makes clear that this reading goes back to a mistake or a correction by a christian scribe.

41. On the influence of Ps 2 on a number of predictions in Jewish pseudepigrapha see M.-A. CHEVALLIER, *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament*, Paris, 1958, pp. 1-50. Unfortunately the text of 4QFlor. is too fragmentary to enable us to say anything with certainty about the application of the quotation from Ps 2, 1-2 found in lines 18-19.

42. On the original ἀρχή in 39, 7 and 40, 3 see P.-M. BOGAERT, *L'Apocalypse de Baruch II* (S.C., 145), Paris, 1969, p. 74.

Bar where 29, 2; 40, 2; 71, 1 speak about the inhabitants of God's country at the time of the Anointed One. The transition between the messianic period and the new era seems to be less abrupt here (30, 1; 40, 3; 74, 2).

The Apocalypse of John seems to have made its own use of Old Testament and Jewish traditions known to the author. How he knew the Jewish traditions, directly or indirectly, remains uncertain. The most recent attempt to isolate Jewish source material concerning the Messiah and concerning the Son of Man with literary critical methods, that of U.B. Müller in his *Messias und Menschensohn in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes*⁴³, has not been very successful in my opinion.

Can we find any significant early Christian parallels? There are a number of texts which speak about the future reign of Jesus, just as there are texts dealing with the future kingdom of God. I mention here Mt 16, 28; 20, 21; 25, 34; Lk 22, 28-30 (cf. 23, 42); 1 Cor 15, 22-28; 2 Pet 1, 11, and also Mk 12, 35-37 and 14, 61-62 (cf. 15, 32). There are also a number of texts that speak about (or imply) the participation of believers in that future reign, Mt 8, 11 f//Lk 13, 28 f; Mt 13, 43; Lk 12, 32; 14, 15; Rom 5, 17; 1 Cor 4, 8 (and 6, 2); 6, 9.10; 15, 50; Gal 5, 21; 2 Th 1, 5; Eph 5, 5 (cf. Col 1, 13). Especially important are Lk 22, 28-30 (par. Mt 19, 28 slightly different); Mt 25, 34; 2 Tim 2, 10-12 and Polycarp Phil 5, 2 where the reigning of the believers is directly connected with that of Jesus. The problem is, however, that only in a few texts is the word *χριστός* used (either as a functional designation or as a name): First we may note Mk 12, 35-37 and 14, 61-62 (cf. 15, 32); here, however, *χριστός* should be qualified in Mark's opinion⁴⁴. Next there is 1 Cor 15, 22-28. Two further instances remain somewhat dubious, unfortunately those where the verb *συμβασιλεύω* is used in connection with the reign of the believers in the future⁴⁵. 2 Tim 2, 11-12 refers to a traditional formula⁴⁶: "If we died with him, we shall live with him; if we endure we shall reign with him", in connection with "the glorious and eternal salvation which is in Christ Jesus" (N.E.B.) in v. 10⁴⁷. Polycarp, in Phil 5, 2, speaks in more general terms about serving the Lord in this world in order to have a share in the next. He, indeed,

43. (SNT. 6), Gütersloh, 1972, pp. 157-216. See also the criticism of T. HOLTZ in the second edition of his *Die Christologie der Apokalypse des Johannes* (see note 1), pp. 244-246.

44. See M. DE JONGE, *The Use of O ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ in the Passion Narratives*, in J. DUPONT (ed.), *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (BETL, 40), Leuven-Gembloux, 1975, pp. 169-192, esp. pp. 173-182.

45. Cf. *βασιλεύω* in Rom 5, 17 and 1 Cor 4, 8 (the *συμβασιλεύω* in the latter verse connects the Corinthians and Paul!).

46. On *πιστός ὁ λόγος* see George W. KNIGHT, III, *The Faithful Sayings in the Pastoral Letters*, Kampen, 1968. On this passage especially pp. 112-137.

47. The use of the *συν*-formulas in 2 Tim 2, 11.12 should be compared with pauline usage. As W. KRAMER, *Christos, Kyrios, Gottessohn* (ATANT, 44), Zürich-Stuttgart, 1963, § 38, has shown, the expression *σὺν χριστῷ* is particularly connected

promised to raise us from the dead "and that we, when our conduct is worthy of him, shall also reign with him, if we believe". Here Jesus is called the Lord who became servant of all, but immediately before we find the phrase θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ διάκονοι.

We shall have to draw the conclusion that the wording βασιλεύω μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ in 20, 4 (cf. v. 6) is particular to the Apocalypse, as is the *ad hoc* phrase ἱερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ in v. 6. Taking up the familiar notion of a future reign of the believers with Jesus Christ at his parousia, the author worked it out in his own way, choosing his own terminology, influenced by Old Testament notions about the Davidic King appointed and anointed by God ⁴⁸.

with dying and rising with Christ (in accordance with the (pre-)pauline use of χριστός in formulas speaking about Christ's death, and about his death and resurrection) whereas σὺν κυρίῳ is used in 1 Th 4, 17 referring to the parousia. The section "Mit Christus" (pp. 400-403) in K. BERGER, "Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel, in *NTS* 17 (1970-1971) 391-425 gives interesting material, but nothing that helps us to understand the wording of Rev 20.4. One example: 4 Ezr 7, 28 speaks about the revelation of "my Son the Anointed One" "cum his qui cum eo sunt", cf. 13, 52; 14, 9 and 6, 26. The last text explains that "homines qui mortem non gustaverunt a nativitate sua" are meant; 14, 9 promises Ezra that he will belong to that company. Here we find an obviously very exclusive group of believers, taking part in the temporary reign meant in 7, 28; the title used in all three texts (7, 28; 13, 52; 14, 9) is "my Son".

48. F. HAHN, in his *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (FRLANT, 83), Göttingen, 1963, pp. 179-189, has tried to prove that in earliest Christianity the χριστός-title was originally used in connection with the parousia of Jesus Christ. The passages discussed in this paper are used as proofs for this hypothesis (pp. 188 f). Unfortunately, his discussion of 11, 15; 12, 10 and 20, 4-6 is far too short to be convincing.

VI

THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN USE OF *CHRISTOS* SOME SUGGESTIONS*

1. OUR OLDEST EVIDENCE

1.1. Anyone who wants to say something about the earliest Christian use of *Christos* should start with the oldest written sources: the (genuine) letters of Paul.

1.1.1. Paul's use of *χριστός* has been set out convincingly by N. A. Dahl¹ and W. Kramer.² The apostle uses the term very frequently: 270 out of the 531 occurrences of the word in the New Testament are found in the genuine letters of Paul.³ He also uses it in combinations with other words: Jesus Christ, Christ Jesus, Jesus Christ the Lord; but never in the combination *κύριος χριστός*.⁴ Certain patterns can be recognized in the use of Jesus Christ and Christ Jesus and also in the use of the article with *χριστός*, but nowhere with a clear difference in meaning.⁵ Dahl says: *χριστός* is never a general term; the word is also never used as a predicate. Paul never feels the necessity to state 'Jesus is the Christ'; a genitive is never added (Paul does not use *χριστός κυρίου* or related expressions) and also *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός* is not found.⁶

For Paul and his readers the term *χριστός* is intimately connected with Jesus. Christ has become a *cognomen* which can be used together with the proper name Jesus – like Peter for the disciple Simon⁷ or Augustus for Octavian and his successors.⁸ The designation/name Christ 'receives its content not through a previously-fixed conception of messiahship but rather from the person and work of Jesus Christ'.⁹

Yet Paul the Jew knew, of course, what the term meant to Jews, and it would be wrong to suppose that the Christian communities outside Palestine for whom he wrote did not know that the word had certain connotations. If Paul in Rom 9. 5 in a list of God's privileges for Israel states: 'of their race, according to the flesh, is *ὁ χριστός*', the titular use of the term is evident. This use may also be, at least partly, intended in a number of other texts.¹⁰ Yet, also in Rom 9. 5 Paul speaks about Jesus *the χριστός* and his point is equally valid for those readers of the passage who would not know that he is using a 'technical' term.

Paul knows that the crucified *χριστός* whom he preaches is a stumbling-block to the Jews (1 Cor 1. 23, cf. Gal 5. 11). In this text as well as in his

* Presidential Address delivered on Tuesday, August 20, 1985 to the 40th General Meeting of *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* at Trondheim.

argument in Gal 3. 13 we may certainly detect autobiographical overtones. The *χριστός ἐσταυρωμένος* was unacceptable to Paul before his call to apostleship; it led him to persecute the church.¹¹ Yet by the time he writes his letters he regards it as unnecessary to prove to his readers that Jesus is ὁ *χριστός* whom the Jews expected; *χριστός* and Ἰησοῦς unequivocally denote one and the same person.

1.1.2. In his analysis of the prepauline use of *χριστός*¹² W. Kramer has shown that *χριστός* is first of all used in the formula *Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ (ἡμῶν/ὅμων etc.)*.¹³

It does not occur in connection with Jesus' resurrection except where his death and resurrection are mentioned together in a number of statements in which Paul clearly refers to the central Christian tenets.¹⁴ Kramer rightly concludes that this type of double formula is an expansion of the shorter one which speaks about Jesus' death only. We find, then, that very early *χριστός* was connected with Jesus' death on behalf of those who belonged to him. At this point I leave aside the question as to whether these formulas originated in Jewish-Hellenistic or in Palestinian-Jewish Christianity; I think that M. Hengel has rightly emphasized that in the less than 20 years between Jesus' death and the earliest letters of Paul the early Christian communities scattered over a geographically restricted area (Palestine, Syria) must have been very active and creative christologically.¹⁵ In view of this explosive growth a distinction between different types and stages of christological thinking connected with different types of Christian communities becomes highly questionable for this early stage. In any case it would be rash to conclude that neither Paul, in whose argumentation the titular use of *χριστός* plays little or no rôle, nor the Christian communities before and around him, were aware of the Jewish connotations of this term which was for Greek speaking people unusual.¹⁶

1.1.3. W. Kramer has rightly pointed out¹⁷ that *χριστός* is also closely connected with *πίστις* - *κήρυγμα* - *εὐαγγέλιον* and the verbs related to these nouns. Very probably, this connection was effected already early, so that Paul is able to introduce himself as an 'apostle of Christ'. The word *χριστός* as the core of what is believed and proclaimed as the gospel refers to the formulas about death and resurrection of Jesus (as is clear from 1 Cor 15. 1-5, 12-19).

The 'Pistisformel' (as W. Kramer calls it) must have served several purposes. It was used in preaching and teaching and will have functioned at baptism.¹⁸ Paul's emphasis on the unity of Christians, baptized into the crucified Christ in 1 Cor 1. 10-17;¹⁹ his plea for unity and diversity in 1 Cor 12²⁰ and his description of the effects of baptism *εἰς Χριστόν* Ἰησοῦν in terms of dying and rising with Christ,²¹ suggest that he took *βαπτισθῆναι εἰς Χριστόν* very seriously. His use of ancient baptismal tradition in Gal 3. 26-29²² suggests that his 'corporate' christology and soteri-

ology were influenced and inspired by pre-pauline notions, connected with people's experience at the ritual of baptism.²³ This is not the place to deal at some length with Paul's corporate terminology in so far as it is connected with *χριστός*.²⁴ But we may assume with confidence that the expression *χριστοῦ εἶναι* is pre-pauline.²⁵

Finally, we may mention the important note in Acts 11. 26 telling us that 'in Antioch the disciples were for the first time called Christians'. This shows that in Hellenistic surroundings the most distinctive feature of the group of followers of Jesus was their allegiance to a certain *χριστός*.²⁶

1.2. This raises the important question how the designation *χριστός* came to be connected with the death (and with the death and resurrection) of Jesus. The answer given by Nils A. Dahl in his article 'The Crucified Messiah', has become very influential in recent scholarship.²⁷ Jesus was crucified as 'king of the Jews', that is as the Messiah. 'This fact had a determinative significance for the Christian kerygma and thus for the ideas of the evangelists'.²⁸ But did Jesus ever agree to this title? With G. Bornkamm and many others Dahl speaks 'not of Jesus' non-messianic history before his passion, but indeed of a movement of broken messianic hopes'.²⁹ The messianic hopes of his followers, his sovereign attitude to the Law and Jewish rules and his behaviour in the temple may well have motivated the authorities to move against him, and accuse him of royal-messianic claims.

Now the crucial question is, did Jesus admit this charge? Here Dahl is as cautious as he is outspoken: 'The inscription of the charge (i.e. on the cross) presupposes that Jesus was accused before Pilate on the ground that he made a royal-messianic claim. If so, one may further infer that Jesus, confronted with the charge that he thought himself to be the Messiah, accepted the accuracy of the charge by his silence, if not in any other way.' In fact, 'Jesus could not deny the charge that he was the Messiah without thereby putting in question the final eschatological validity of his whole message.' And by not denying he accepted the cross, willingly: 'his willingness to suffer is implicit in Jesus' behaviour and attitude throughout his preaching'.³⁰

In the end, Dahl's theory centres around the presupposition 'that it must have been Jesus' opponents who put messiahship in the foreground and made it the decisive question of life and death'.³¹ Their accusation and Jesus' reaction to it led to the adoption of the *χριστός*-title in the early Christian community, the connection between *χριστός* and Jesus' death and, ultimately, to the complete christianization of the title.

1.3. In its original German version, Dahl's article was a contribution to the 'new quest' of the historical Jesus, and among the many publications of the period it still stands out as one of lasting value. It answers the question of the early Christian use of *χριστός* by means of a historical reconstruction.

Now, as we are all aware, the historical problems concerning Jesus' crucifixion are very thorny ones. Jesus' crucifixion was a hard fact to Paul (before and after his calling) and to his fellow-Jews. But are we really able to prove beyond doubt that Jesus was indeed crucified as king of the Jews?³² Our principal source of information is Mark and it is, again, notoriously difficult to recover the earlier written material he had at his disposal and to determine its *Wortlaut* with any certainty. Mark may or may not have been a conservative redactor,³³ yet we are not able to define what groups of Christians said some twenty years or so before Mark, let alone to reconstruct the *ipsissima verba Jesu*. Form-critical analysis may be of great help, of course, but here again conclusions or even definite results as to the *Sitz im Leben*, let alone the historical situation in the pre-Markan period, are very difficult to arrive at. It is one thing to discover that an author uses traditional material, and use this insight to interpret this author's words, and quite another to determine the meaning(s) this material may have had before it was incorporated by the author concerned.³⁴

1.4. Does this mean that it is impossible to reach any clarity in the question why *χριστός* became the pivotal title in early (and later) Christianity? In the present exposition I intend to leave aside the problems connected with earlier stages in the written and oral tradition before Mark and the reconstruction of historical events, and will concentrate on two questions: Can we learn anything from the use of *χριστός* in the Gospel of Mark as it stands? After all it is our oldest written account of Jesus' life and death. How does Mark use the term, and why?

And, secondly: Does this use make sense if we compare it with what we know of the use of the term 'anointed' in contemporary Jewish sources?

In my analysis of Mark's use of the term and in the review of the Jewish material I shall, of necessity, be brief. This also applies to the points arising from the comparison of Mark and the Jewish sources. In part I have been able to use my own earlier studies on the subject;³⁵ I may also refer to J. H. Charlesworth's report of a stimulating meeting of the S.N.T.S. Pseudepigrapha Seminar at Durham in August 1979, devoted to the subject chosen for today, where I gave an introduction to two of the sessions.³⁶ I hope that in restricting myself to the main lines of the argument, I shall be able to stimulate further discussion on an important subject – and that is, perhaps, precisely what a presidential address should do.

2. MARK'S USE OF *ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ*³⁷

2.1. Surprisingly, Mark uses *χριστός* in only seven places. In two of them he uses traditional Christian expressions which do not necessarily contain a conscious reference to a titular use of the term. In 1. 1 Mark characterizes

the narrative he is going to tell as the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.³⁸ He does not want to emphasize Jesus' messiahship, but uses the double expression 'Jesus Christ' as many Christians before and after him without any titular overtones.³⁹ The emphasis is on 'the Son of God' – if, indeed, the long text is original – a designation that is very important in Mark. In 9. 41 Jesus addresses disciples going out in his name as people who are 'of Christ' – again a traditional expression that shows the continuing importance of the term *χριστός* in early Christianity but does not prove that Mark (or Christians before and around him) wanted to indicate that these disciples were 'followers of the Messiah'.⁴⁰

2.2. The term *χριστός* is not used between 1. 1 and 8. 29,⁴¹ Peter's confession in Caesarea Philippi. In 1. 2–15 the emphasis is on Jesus' preaching; he is the herald of the imminent kingdom of God,⁴² calling people to repentance and to faith in the gospel of God. He is parallel to and superior to John the Baptist.⁴³ The central verses, however, are verses 9–11, where Mark reveals to his readers the secret of Jesus' identity by letting God himself intervene in the story: Jesus was inspired and authorized by God's own spirit, and is called 'my Beloved Son' at his baptism.⁴⁴

When, in the next section, running to 8. 26, the evangelist describes Jesus' preaching, teaching, healing and exorcisms at some length, making use, no doubt, of much earlier material, many people wonder about the source of his authority and power.⁴⁵ 'The people' (*οἱ ἄνθρωποι*), we hear just before Peter's confession (8. 27–28), regarded him as a revived John the Baptist, or as Elijah who had come back, or as one of the prophets. Mark reports this twice in different contexts (see also 6. 14–16). This shows that he regards these reactions as important, presumably also as understandable in view of Jesus' ministry as herald of God's kingdom. Yet he leaves us in no doubt as to their being wrong. John the Baptist was the returned Elijah (9. 11–13), and he had *not* come back to life after his execution.⁴⁶ The readers, who have been told who Jesus really is, hear that only the evil spirits recognize Jesus as 'Son of God'⁴⁷ – there is no adequate human statement formulating the secret of Jesus' words and actions.

2.3. Peter's confession in 8. 29, elicited by Jesus and in contrast to what 'the people' say, is, therefore, of crucial importance. Here the disciples, through Peter, confess *σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός*. For Mark (as for his readers) this is a well-known confession, and Peter's uttering it here does not come as a surprise. The question is, however, what it means, and this is the question Mark intends to answer. On the one hand Mark, introducing *ὁ χριστός* at this point in his narrative, must have regarded it as a suitable term to designate Jesus whom he has described as a unique preacher, teacher and exorcist at the turn of the times. Peter's confession is spoken after he has witnessed Jesus' activity in Galilee; in fact, this is the sole foundation upon

which Peter could base his confession. Yet disciples of Jesus 'the Christ' should know that there is more to be taken into account.

Therefore Mark describes how Jesus enjoins his disciples to keep this secret (8. 30), and how, in the subsequent conversation, Jesus predicts his suffering, death and resurrection (8. 31) – a prediction repeated twice (9. 31; 10. 32–34).⁴⁸ He also announces that those who follow him must be ready to lose their lives 'for me and the gospel' (8. 35). They will be vindicated when Jesus returns in the glory of his Father to introduce the kingdom of God in power (8. 38–9. 1). The term *χριστός* is not used here by Jesus, who designates himself as 'Son of Man' in connection with his forthcoming death and resurrection (where the pre-Pauline 'double formula' favoured *χριστός*) and also with his public vindication at the parousia.

In Mark, as elsewhere in the New Testament, 'the Son of Man' is used only by Jesus as a self-designation; for him and his readers the striking Greek expression *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* must have been connected exclusively with Jesus in the tradition, and must have had titular force. Yet (as J. D. Kingsbury has noted⁴⁹) although it is linked with Jesus' authority now and in the future and with his conflict with the Jewish authorities, it does not really disclose the secret of Jesus' identity. It is not used in confessions of his disciples, and never taken up by his adversaries.

In 8. 30–9. 1 Mark does not want to introduce a new title but reminds his readers that the confession *ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ χριστός* presupposes the entire story of the death, the resurrection and the parousia of Jesus as one who shares in God's glory and in God's kingly rule. In 8. 38 Jesus implicitly refers to his being 'Son of God' when he speaks of the coming of the Son of Man 'in the glory of his Father' (cf. 10. 35–40). This is confirmed, in the story of Jesus' transfiguration (9. 2–8) in the presence of Moses and Elijah, by God himself who, again intervening in the story, calls him 'my beloved Son' and urges his disciples to listen to him. Only three disciples are present and they are told to keep this secret until after the resurrection (9. 9–10). The repetition of the secrecy command emphasizes that the disciples will only understand completely what they confess after Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection and their meeting with him in Galilee, announced in 16. 7 (cf. 16. 6 and 14. 27–28).

2.4. Apart from 9. 41, which has already been mentioned above, and which, though representing traditional usage, proves that Jesus (according to Mark) did not avoid the *χριστός*-title when he referred to himself, the term does not occur again before 12. 35–37 when, after a series of *Streit- und Schulgespräche* has come to an end (12. 34), Jesus himself raises the question about the identity of *ὁ χριστός*.

Earlier in the story, the chief priests, scribes and elders, after Jesus' action at the Temple, question his authority (11. 27–33). Jesus compares

himself with John the Baptist whom the crowd regards as a prophet who had received his authority from God; in the following parable of the wicked husbandmen (12. 1–12) Jesus gives the decisive answer by comparing himself with ‘the beloved Son’, the final envoy of God in a succession of divine messengers, the prophets; a reference to Ps 118. 22–23 gives an equally implicit reference to his death and resurrection. According to Mark, his adversaries understood what he meant, and therefore tried to arrest him (12. 12).

Still earlier, Mark introduces the designation ‘Son of David’. Jesus is twice addressed as such by Bartimaeus who hopes to be healed by him. He is healed, Jesus praises his faith and he begins to follow Jesus (10. 46–52).⁵⁰ At Jesus’ entry in Jerusalem, the disciples and a wider group of people accompanying Jesus⁵¹ hail him as the one who comes in the name of the Lord and associate him with ‘the coming kingdom of our father David’ (11. 1–11). Mark clearly accepts ‘Son of David’ as a suitable designation of Jesus, and we have to take this into account when we interpret 12. 35–37. Here Jesus introduces the thesis *ὁ χριστός υἱὸς Δαβὶδ ἐστίν* as a typical opinion of the scribes; he objects that David himself, in Ps 110. 1, called him Lord. Jesus does not identify himself with ‘the Messiah’, but it is clear that he is not dealing with a purely theoretical question from the point of view of Mark and his readers. Ps 110. 1 is a well-known Christian proof-text⁵² connected with the parousia of Jesus as the Christ and the Son of God by Paul in 1 Cor 15. 20–28; Jesus has already been addressed as ‘Son of David’ by Bartimaeus earlier on. The story in 12. 35–37 has an open ending. Yet it cannot possibly have been intended to criticize the use of ‘Son of David’ for Jesus, the Christ – or to advocate the use of the designation ‘Son of Man’ or ‘Lord’. It wants to make clear that the true Son of David/Messiah is different from what the scribes expect.⁵³

2.5. How different he is the reader of Mark’s gospel discovers in 14. 61–62, where Jesus answers ‘I am’, when the high priest in a session of the Sanhedrin asks him, *σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ*; He acknowledges, publicly, that he is *ὁ χριστός* and that he is ‘Son of God’ when the high priest uses these terms and uses them in conjunction. He adds, however, a statement concerning his activity in the (immediate) future, referring to himself as ‘the Son of Man’: ‘You will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Power (a reference to Ps 110. 1, the psalm-verse quoted in 12. 35–37) and coming with the clouds of heaven (a reference to Dan 7. 13).’ Jesus the Son of Man will reign (Dan 7. 14, cf. Mark 13. 26) as Son of David/Messiah/Son of God when God’s kingly rule will be established on earth (8. 38–9. 1).⁵⁴

The royal connotations of the high priest’s question are brought out very clearly in Mark’s report of the proceedings before Pilate and the narrative of the crucifixion in chapter 15. There is much that Mark does not tell;⁵⁵

his readers seem to know who Pilate is and they are expected to understand why he asked Jesus *σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων* (15. 2): the accusations of the Sanhedrin are nowhere expressly formulated (15. 1 and 3). Only much later in the story the chief priests and the scribes are portrayed as mocking him, and addressing him as 'the Christ, the King of Israel' (15. 32). Giving their interpretation of Jesus' answer to the high priest and disregarding his statement that his royal authority would only manifest itself at God's time (however imminent) the Jewish leaders, according to Mark, denounced him as 'King of Israel' to Pilate, who takes this accusation up in his question/statement *σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. This time Jesus answers *σὺ λέγεις* – at most a qualified 'yes'. The term 'King of the Jews' recurs in a statement by Pilate who hesitates (15. 12), and at the inscription on (or near) the cross (15. 26). It is also used by the soldiers when they mock Jesus (15. 18).⁵⁶

The crucifixion story ends with the confession of the centurion who, after having seen Jesus die, declares: 'Truly this man was the Son of God' (15. 39). Apart from the fact that the imperfect is used, this is the true confession – Jesus' resurrection will make clear that Christians may change the imperfect to the present tense.⁵⁷ Yet in 15. 1–26, 32 it is not denied that Jesus is the King of Israel; only, he was and is king in his own way: the one who allows himself to be mocked by the soldiers and by the chief priests and scribes; he does not save himself nor does he come down from the cross 'that we (the chief priests and the scribes) may see and believe'.⁵⁸ He is not a king in the political sense, nor is he a *λήσσης* (15. 27) or an insurgent like Barabbas (15. 7, 11). His kingly rule will only be revealed at the parousia, when the crucified Christ will be shown to be triumphant. During his life the authority of him whom his disciples rightly confess as *ὁ χριστός* is that of a messenger of God, a herald of God's imminent kingdom, inspired in a unique way by the Spirit: indeed the Son of God.⁵⁹ His *εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ* has to be accepted, and is handed on by Mark and all other Christian teachers and preachers as the 'gospel about Jesus Christ' (1. 1).⁶⁰ 2.6. A brief remark on 13. 21–22 has to be added. In the days of tribulation before the arrival of the Son of Man 'in clouds with great power and glory' (13. 26) people will say to the disciples, 'Look, here is *ὁ χριστός*' or 'There he is'. Do not believe them, Jesus says, *ψευδόχριστοι* and *ψευδοπροφῆται* will arise and show signs and wonders to lead astray the elect.⁶¹ Amidst many conflicting expectations and rumours about the arrival of the Messiah, the disciples need not waver. They know whom they may expect and how he will come; 13. 24–26 takes up 8. 38 and will be followed by 14. 62.⁶²

2.7. Summing up, we may say:

- a. Mark presupposes the confession: Jesus is the Christ (Messiah). This confession divides Christians and Jews.

- b. The title *χριστός* implies the entire story told in the *εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ χριστοῦ*: life, death, resurrection, parousia of this Jesus.
- c. It is a term suitable for denoting Jesus' authoritative preaching as well as his future kingly rule.
- d. *ὁ χριστός* is the 'Son of David' and, above all, he is the 'Son of God'.
- e. If disciples of Jesus confess that *ὁ χριστός* was crucified but rose again, and admit that he died on the cross, it has to be denied very strongly that this Messiah belongs to the category of *λήσται* and *στασιασταί* like Barabbas. Not only in 15. 1-26, 32 but also in 13. 21-22 false ideas about Jesus' messiahship are contradicted.

3. THE USE OF THE TERM 'ANointed' IN CONTEMPORANEOUS JEWISH SOURCES⁶⁵

3.1. The references in Christian documents to views expressed by non-Christian Jewish opponents are difficult to handle. They cannot be taken as independent evidence for views held by Jews in the time of Jesus, the apostles or the author of the particular document, but function primarily within the context of the document in view of the christology of the author.⁶⁴ Mark's picture of the ideas connected with the term 'the Messiah' by Jesus' opponents may not lead us to pay inordinate attention to the picture of the future Davidic king in PssSol 17, 18, or to emphasize the so-called national-political elements in that picture.

3.2. Considerable confusion also arises from unclear terminology: so the terms 'Messiah' and 'messianic' are often used in a wider sense, denoting any (more or less) human eschatological mediator, regardless of the fact whether he is called 'anointed' or not. It is not helpful to call every '*zukünftige Erlösergestalt*' (E.T. 'future redeemer/saviour'),⁶⁵ or 'Agent of Divine Deliverance'⁶⁶ a 'Messiah'. In fact, the word 'anointed' is used surprisingly seldom of future mediating figures in the literary sources around the beginning of the Christian era, and apart from the uncertain instance 1QSa 2. 12, the absolute use of the term ('the Messiah') is found only in some places in Syriac Ap. Baruch and 4 Ezra.

It is even less helpful to denote the expectation of God's final intervention in the future as 'messianic expectation'. The appearance of a mediating figure ('human', 'angelic', 'divine'), whatever name or title he may have, is not a regular or indispensable element. *Verba valent usu*, but to speak about 'Messianism without a Messiah'⁶⁷ does not contribute to greater clarity of thought.

We shall do well to concentrate on the actual terms used in our sources to describe certain figures. In doing so we should realize that a term does not stand for a fixed concept, but rather brings with it a wealth of connotations made more or less explicit in a given context (e.g. through citation

of texts from Scripture, combination of certain words and images traditionally connected with that particular term). There is room for considerable variety; we cannot isolate a term or a set of expressions but should consider them in the context of the document in which they are used. As always, a combination of a diachronic and a synchronic approach is needed.

3.3. A term may also have different sets of connotations. It has often been remarked that in the Old Testament 'anointed' and 'anointing'⁶⁸ are used, in connection with kings, high priests and other priests, and with prophets. There is no need to go into details here. Let me just remind you that the term משיח יהוה/LXX *χριστός κυρίου* is used for Saul, David and Davidic kings (and once for Cyrus, Isa 45. 1). In four places (Lev 4. 3, 5, 16; 6. 15) we find the term 'the anointed (high-)priest' הכהן המשיח. (In the LXX *ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός* (4. 5, 16; 6. 15) and *ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κεχρισμένος* (4. 3).) As to prophets: 1 Kings 19. 16 announces the anointing of Elisha by Elijah to be prophet in his place (parallel to that of Jehu to be king over Israel); in Isa 61. 1 we read 'the Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me'; and, finally, in Psalm 105. 15 'Touch not my anointed ones'⁶⁹ stands parallel to 'do my prophets no harm'.

This varied OT usage of the term is reflected in later Jewish sources. In particular the picture of David, the idealized descriptions of Davidic kings in a number of royal psalms (for instance 2, 89, 110, 132), and prophetic texts about the coming of a true son of David (above all Isa 11. 1–10), where the term 'anointed' does not occur, have been influential, but also the 'priestly' and the 'prophetic' use of the term 'anointed' are found a few times.

We should, however, not speak of a royal, priestly, or prophetic Messiah but of a future king, high priest and prophet who are in a few places called 'anointed'.

Some years ago I characterized the situation as to the Qumran documents as follows: 'They . . . expect a number of figures sent by God, to none of whom the designation "anointed one" belongs exclusively. It is not the persons as such that are important, but their calling and function because it is through them that God shows his continuing care and his power to overcome all opposition. The central point is that God will bring about a change in the history of his people and that thenceforward, Israel will have a true prince and/or a true highpriest or prophet.'⁷⁰ The same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, also to the expectation in other Jewish groups whose writings we possess of God's future intervention.

3.4. By way of illustration I briefly mention a number of points which are relevant in the context of the present lecture.

3.4.1. The expectation of a future highpriest is very important in the priestly sect of Qumran. The term 'anointed' is connected with him in the term משיח אהרן וישראל in 1QS 9. 11. In the Damascus Document we find the

term *משיח אהרן וישראל*⁷¹ but it remains disputed whether this expression also refers to two persons or only to a single one. Also if a single person is envisaged,⁷² his descent from Aaron (mentioned first) as well as his anointed status receives attention.

3.4.2. The same text 1QS 9. 11 mentions the coming of a prophet with the anointed ones from Aaron and Israel. Although prophets in the past are called 'the anointed with the Holy Spirit', this designation is not used here for the future prophet.⁷³ In 11QMelch line 18, however, in all probability the one who brings good tidings of Isa 52. 7 is called *משיח הרוח*. The use of this expression presupposes a combination of Isa 52. 7 and 61. 1.⁷⁴

3.4.3. If we now turn briefly to the expected Davidic king, we note above all the great variety in the announcements and descriptions of this figure.

3.4.3.1. The king expected in PsSol 17⁷⁵ is a national figure using political means and even military power (verses 22, 24, 26, 28–30). Yet, particularly in the last part of the psalm (verses 30–45), all emphasis is on the spiritual aspects of his reign; the deliverance of Israel is only a means towards a greater goal, the triumph of God's righteousness and power as manifested in his *torah*, which will then be obeyed by Israel and the nations. Verse 37 tells us, referring to Isa 11. 1–5, 'And he (the king) will not be weak in his days with regard to his God for God has made him strong with holy spirit, and wise in the counsel of understanding with strength and righteousness'. This king is called 'an anointed (of the) Lord' in verse 32 almost in passing – it is a qualification rather than a title.⁷⁶

3.4.3.2. In Qumran the *משיח ישראל* is clearly subordinate to the highpriest. 1QSa 2. 14, 20 leave no doubt about that. Whether he is called *המשיח* in 1QSa 2. 11–12 is not certain, because of the defectiveness of the text. The future king belongs to the family of David, as is clear from 4Qpatr 3 (*משיח* parallel to *צמח דוד*) and 4Qflor 7–13 which quotes several phrases from 2 Sam 7, including 'I will be his father and he shall be my son' from verse 14, and applies them to the 'Branch of David'.

In the Blessing for the Prince of the Congregation (1QSb 5. 20–29) the ideal king is called upon to establish the kingdom of his people for ever; as in PsSol 17, Isa 11. 4 and 5 play an important part, but the emphasis is clearly on his strength and valour in the wars against the nations. Yet in the War Scroll the 'Prince of all the Congregation' is mentioned only in passing (1QM 5. 1); he does not play any rôle in the eschatological battle. Very telling is 4Q161. 8–10 which, after quoting Isa 11. 1–5, gives the following comment on vs 3: 'as they (the priests) teach him (= the Branch of David who will stand up at the end of times', line 17) so shall he judge . . .' (lines 20–21). Though Isa 11 assures that the Spirit of the Lord will be upon this future descendant of David, the interpretation makes him dependent on the priests.

3.4.3.3. In the parables of Enoch the complex heavenly figure which is

designated with various terms, is twice called 'his Messiah/anointed'. In the phrase 'for they have denied the Lord of the Spirits and his Messiah' in 48. 10 the term occurs because of the clear reference to Ps 2. 2. In 52. 4 the emphasis is equally on the reign and authority of 'his Messiah' (called 'the Chosen One' in verse 6). The term is used purely *ad hoc* in connection with the reign of the heavenly figure concerned. There is no reason to think in terms of merging of fixed concepts, say 'a Son of Man' concept (the existence of which has been strongly denied lately)⁷⁷ and a 'Davidic Messiah' concept.

3.4.3.4. I cannot deal with the many problems connected with 4 Ezra and Syr. Apoc. Baruch. For our present purpose it is important that they portray a royal figure who reigns during a limited period. 4 Ezra 12. 32 designates him as 'hic est unctus quem reservabit Altissimus in finem'. In all versions except the Latin one his Davidic descent is mentioned. Syr. Ap. Baruch mentions this royal figure several times, calling him *m^eshichi* 'my Anointed' in 39. 7; 40. 1; 72. 2; *'abdi m^eshicha* 'my servant the Anointed' in 70. 9 and *m^eshicha* in 29. 3; 30. 1. The importance of these two apocalypses dating from the end of the first or the beginning of the second century A.D. is not so much that they show us yet other possible variations on the theme of the future ideal king in the descriptions and interpretations of the visions contained in them, but that they, at least in some cases, use the term absolutely, to denote the future king. We should be very cautious, however, in using this evidence to explain the use of the term *ὁ χριστός* in the writings of the NT, because of its date and because of the fact that these apocalypses have been transmitted to us by Christian scribes. Particularly in passages dealing with the future king their influence is to be suspected.⁷⁸

3.4.3.5. Let me add a short reference to the 14th Benediction in the Eighteen Benedictions as found in the so-called Palestinian recension, praying amongst other things for 'the kingdom of David, Thine Anointed' (or: the Anointed of your righteousness). God is praised as the 'God of David, rebuilder of Jerusalem'. The emphasis is clearly on the Davidic monarchy and it is David, not a future descendant of his, who is called 'your Anointed'.⁷⁹

3.5. New Testament scholars have often referred to Josephus' description of the turbulent times between the death of Herod the Great and the destruction of Jerusalem and pointed to the many 'messianic figures' he mentions during that period. The problem of employing Josephus as a source for the Jewish use of *χριστός* in the times of Jesus is, however, that he avoids the term when speaking about the figures just mentioned; it is only found in Ant 18. 63-64 and 20. 200 in connection with Jesus.

Now it is also clear that if Josephus – who is by no means an unbiased reporter – does not call any of these people 'messiah' or even 'pseudo-

messiah', some of them may have been regarded as such by their followers. Some years ago, in an article for the Michel Festschrift, I concluded, referring to Menahem and Simon son of Giora: 'Es erscheint mir nicht als deutlich, dass einige der Anführer der Widerstandsbewegungen gegen die Römer als gesalbte Könige betrachtet wurden.'⁸⁰ In the case of Menahem and Simon Josephus mentions that they behaved like kings and were regarded as such by their followers. In the case of others (the prophet from Egypt, Theudas, a prophet in Samaria)⁸¹ his description makes it clear that they acted as Mosaic prophets. They should *a fortiori* not be called (pseudo-) messiahs. In a very interesting recent article 'Popular Messianic Movements around the Time of Jesus'⁸² Richard A. Horsley has tried to use the admittedly meagre evidence in the hostile reports by Josephus to analyse the popular movements led by kings in the Palestine of the first century A.D. He has many interesting remarks on Menahem and Simon son of Giora (as well as on the earlier figures Judas, Simon and Athronges). They lead him to the conclusion, 'Informed by the popular memory of messianic movements among their distant ancestors led by David or other anointed figures, groups of Jewish peasants were now attempting to assert their independence of outside control and to re-establish just social relations in their society under the leadership of a new king whom they (and God) had acclaimed.'⁸³ I do not feel competent to give a proper assessment of his argumentation, but his intention to look for 'social phenomena among the Jewish peasantry' that 'would appear to provide more concrete and relevant evidence for messianic activity at the time of Jesus than the literary texts usually adduced'⁸⁴ is certainly to be welcomed.

4. THE USE OF Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ FOR JESUS

4.1. Questions about the time when God would bring about the expected decisive and final turn of events and whether he would use a human, angelic or whatever other mediator no longer concerned the first 'Christians'. God had acted and would act, and Jesus was and would be the 'agent of divine deliverance'. Their concern is to explain why he was as he was, and why he was crucified and rose again; also to make clear what this meant to his followers now and at the time of his parousia and the realization of God's kingly rule on earth. For their explanations they searched the Scriptures and used the conceptions of the Jews among whom they lived.

Their faith was Jesucentric, and it was from this perspective that they interpreted their Bible and looked upon the expectations of their fellow-Jews. In discussion and debate, within the community of followers of Jesus and with Jews outside, the burning question was whether Jesus was the one in whom God's promises had been fulfilled and would be fulfilled

soon. Are we able to explain how this Jesucentric faith became Christocentric? How could *ὁ χριστός* become the central title for Jesus?

4.2. Let us return to Mark. The brief survey given in the previous section shows that it is quite natural that Mark connects *ὁ χριστός* with the Son of David. I think it also helps us to understand how *ὁ χριστός* and 'Son of God' are so closely related in Mark – but to demonstrate this statement (and to qualify it) one would need much more time than is available now. It is also clear that Mark could not avoid explaining clearly how the reign of the anointed Son of David on behalf of God the king of Israel would take effect. We have seen that for Mark and his readers it is very important to state that this will only take place in the future; at this point misunderstanding on the part of the Jews may arise and, no doubt, has arisen.

The notion that the anointed Son of David was empowered by the Spirit also finds support in Jewish sources. Isa 11. 1–5 exercised a great influence on Jewish expectations concerning the coming Son of David.⁸⁵ Yet we have not yet presented evidence which explains how *ὁ χριστός* – Son of David could be a suitable designation for Jesus as prophet-preacher-teacher-healer-exorcist.

4.3.1. The clue to the solution of this problem is given in Mark 12. 36, where Jesus' quotation of Ps 110. 1 is introduced by the words *Δαυὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ*.⁸⁶ 'David was a prophet', says Acts 2. 30, after giving a similar quotation from Ps 16. 8–10; and also Acts 1. 16 and 4. 25 emphasize that he spoke by the Holy Spirit.⁸⁷ This goes back to 1 Sam 16. 13; immediately after he was anointed, 'the Spirit came mightily upon David' (as it came on Saul earlier) (1 Sam 10. 6, 10, 12). The next verse tells us that the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul who was from that time onwards tormented by an evil spirit. It was David who by singing his hymns made the evil spirit depart (1 Sam 16. 14–23). Also important is 2 Sam 23. 1–7 which gives the last words of David. In verse 2, after the introduction of the speaker in verse 1 as 'the Anointed of the God of Jacob',⁸⁸ we read 'the Spirit of the Lord speaks by me, his word is upon my tongue'.

These verses from Scripture were taken seriously around the beginning of the Christian era. Josephus, Ant 6. 166–168 tells us '... the Deity abandoned Saul and passed over to David who, when the divine spirit had removed to him, began to prophesy', and he continues with the description of David's exorcisms.⁸⁹ Ps Philo LAB 59 makes David sing a psalm immediately after Samuel has anointed him,⁹⁰ and describes his nightly singing for Saul in the next chapter. In chapter 59 as well as in chapter 60 we get a specimen of a Davidic psalm. This leads us to 11QPs^a 'David's compositions' found in the Psalms Scroll discovered in Qumran Cave 11, immediately after 2 Sam 23. 1–7.⁹¹ Among other things David is praised as wise, literate, discerning and perfect in all his ways. The Lord gave him a discern-

ing and enlightened spirit (רוח נבונה ואורה) (lines 2–4)). He wrote 3600 psalms and no less than 450 songs, 4 of which were songs for making music over the stricken' (line 10)⁹² The text concludes with the words: 'All these he spoke through prophecy (דבר בנבואה) which was given him from before the Most High' (line 11).

If Scripture and tradition gave a picture of David as a prophet and an exorcist it is quite understandable that these functions were also attributed to the expected Davidic king, who was supposed to be empowered by the Spirit. If, in Mark also, Jesus' activity as prophet, teacher, healer and exorcist is subsumed under the heading 'Christ, Son of David', this does not mean the introduction of a strange or incompatible element.

4.3.2. A number of scholars⁹³ have argued lately that the 'Son of David'-conception found in the gospels was also inspired by traditions concerning the exorcist activities of Solomon, the Son of David. A cautious assessment of the evidence can be found in D. C. Duling, 'Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David' (1975), who fails to find a clear reference to the Davidic descent of Solomon the exorcist, or a use of 'Son of David' as title or address.⁹⁴ It is not impossible that Mark was influenced by this tradition in the Bartimaeus story (10. 46–52). But, as Duling says, 'If Mark knew the Solomon-as-exorcist material why did he not introduce it in the first half? Why does he introduce Son of David in a general healing and not in exorcism?'⁹⁵

4.4. When this Society met in St Andrews in September 1961 the late W. C. van Unnik devoted his presidential address to the topic 'Jesus the Christ'.⁹⁶ In the last part of this stimulating paper he points to the quotation from Isa 61. 1 in Luke 4. 16–21 and to Acts 10. 38. 'What Jesus proclaims and performs is possible because he has been anointed and possesses the Spirit of God.'⁹⁷ He asks, 'Is this a speciality of Lucan theology?' but thinks that the answer to this question must be in the negative. He quotes the texts about Saul and David just mentioned and also refers to the anointing of Elisha (1 Kings 19. 16). He points to the prophets as 'those anointed with the Holy Spirit' in the Damascus Document, to PsSol 17. 32 (and the influence of Isaiah 11. 2 there), and also to 2 Cor 1. 22 f.⁹⁸

Van Unnik's theory received support, when a few years later 11QM¹⁸ with its combination of Isa 52. 7 and Isa 61. 1 could be reconstructed.⁹⁹ Yet it suffers from not distinguishing clearly enough between the conception of the descendant of David, the prophet and the conception of 'the anointed prophet'. There is no doubt that Isa 52. 7; 61. 1 and related texts in Isaiah 40–66 are important for the understanding of the NT use of *εὐαγγέλιον* and *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* in connection with *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*,¹⁰⁰ but I cannot find any sign that Jesus' preaching of good news to the poor was connected with 'anointing through the Spirit' before Luke. In Jesus' answer to the question of John the Baptist in Q (Matt 11. 2–6//

Luke 7. 18–23) the word *χριστός* did not occur.¹⁰¹ It is Matthew who adds a reference to *τὰ ἔργα τοῦ χριστοῦ* in the introduction to the story (11. 2), and Luke who takes up the beginning of Isa 61. 1 in 4. 18. And in Mark 1. 14–15 Jesus as the herald of the kingdom of God has received the Spirit; Mark does not say that he was anointed by the Spirit nor does he intend any connection with the *εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in 1. 1.¹⁰²

4.5. The cautious, limited approach in the present lecture does not allow me to draw conclusions with regard to the convictions of the Jesus of history, his first followers and his first opponents. But let me end with a few tentative remarks, if only in order not to disappoint you.

The main question is: Does Mark's picture of misunderstanding and misrepresentation of the Christian message of Jesus, the crucified Christ, by the Jews and their leaders and by the Roman authorities in any way reflect Jesus' own conflict with the Jewish leaders and the Roman governor? Here the fact that *χριστός* became the central designation for Jesus already very early is, indeed, highly important. If the formula 'Christ died for us' was coined very shortly after Jesus' death and resurrection by people who realized the connotations of the term *χριστός/πρωτος*, the term must already have been important during Jesus' lifetime. Was it used by his opponents, although he himself never laid a messianic claim – and was it used at such a crucial moment that Jesus, in the end, could not deny the charge that he was the Messiah?

Once we realize the great variety in the Jewish expectations concerning the future anointed Davidic king, and see that the inclusion of prophecy and exorcism into the picture of the true descendant of David must have been easy, there is no need to deny that Jesus' earliest followers could identify him with the expected Son of David. And Jesus himself? He was, no doubt, 'der Mann der all Schemen sprengt' (to use E. Schweizer's well-known phrase). But why should he have avoided the title 'Messiah', if it could mean what I have tried to describe, and if he could give his own creative interpretation of it?

NOTES

[1] 'Die Messianität Jesu bei Paulus', *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan* (Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953) 83–95; a translated and redacted version 'The Messiahship of Jesus in Paul' is found in N. A. Dahl, *The crucified Messiah and other Essays* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974) 37–47.

[2] *Christos Kyrios Gottessohn* (ATHANT 44; Zürich: Zwingli, 1963) §§2–14, 31–41, 60–5. See also M. Hengel, 'Erwägungen zum Sprachgebrauch von *χριστός* bei Paulus und in der 'vorpaulinischen' Überlieferung', *Paul and Paulinism. Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett* (London: SPCK, 1982) 135–58. After listing the most important literature on the subject (p. 149 n. 1) Hengel remarks: 'Grundlegend sind nach wie vor die Untersuchungen von Dahl und Kramer.'

[3] So M. Hengel, 'Erwägungen', 135.

[4] See W. Kramer, *Christos*, §65; on Rom 16. 18 see M. Hengel, 'Erwägungen', 139 (and n. 36).

- [5] W. Kramer, *Christos*, §§61–4. [6] 'The Messiahship of Jesus', 37.
- [7] See W. Grundmann, *TWNT* 9 (1973) 535 n. 326 and K. Berger, 'Zur traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel', *NTS* 17 (1970–1) 391–425, cf. 391–2. Berger qualifies 'Christ' and 'Peter' as 'eschatologische Eigennamen'.
- [8] See W. Grundmann, *TWNT* 9 (1973) 535 and M. Hengel, 'Erwägungen', 139.
- [9] N. A. Dahl, 'The Messiahship of Jesus', 40.
- [10] N. A. Dahl, 'The Messiahship of Jesus', 40 and n. 11 and 12, detects 'Messianic connotations' in Rom 15. 7; 1 Cor 1. 23; 10. 4; 15. 22; 2 Cor 5. 10; 11. 2–3; Gal 3. 16; Phil 1. 15, 17 and 3. 7. He adds 'But in no case in Paul can *Christos* be translated with Messiah'. Cf. W. Kramer, *Christos*, §62 and M. Hengel, 'Erwägungen', 138. See also Rom 1. 3–4 where Paul, quoting an ancient formula, mentions Jesus' descent from David.
- [11] Cf. 1 Cor 1. 13, 17–18; 2. 2, 8; 2 Cor 13. 4; Gal 3. 1; 6. 12, 14; Phil 2. 8; 3. 18. The emphasis on the crucifixion is typically Pauline. Paul's personal involvement is rightly emphasized by M. Hengel, 'Erwägungen', 142. He also stresses that the communities to whom Paul wrote his letters must have had many Christians of Jewish descent and 'Godfearers' in their midst. In Pauline circles the original meaning of *χριστός* and its eschatological connotations must have remained influential during the progressive 'christianization' of the designation.
- [12] See *Christos*, §§1–8.
- [13] See Rom 5. 6, 8; 14. 15; (1 Cor 8. 11); 2 Cor 5. 14–15; 1 Thess 5. 9–10. Cf. 1 Cor 1. 13; Gal 2. 21; 3. 13.
- [14] 1 Cor 15. 3–5; 2 Cor 5. 15; Rom 8. 34; 14. 9; 1 Thess 4. 14. In the first two texts we find *ὁπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν* and *ὁπὲρ αὐτῶν* respectively, cf. Rom 4. 25.
- [15] See his important article 'Christologie und neutestamentliche Chronologie', *Neues Testament und Geschichte*, Fs. O. Cullmann (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1972) 43–67. Hengel emphasizes the role of Hellenistic-Jewish Christians in and outside Jerusalem. See e.g. also his 'Zwischen Jesus und Paulus', *ZThK* 72 (1975) 151–206 and his 'Der stellvertretende Sühnetod Jesu. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung des urchristlichen Kerygmas', *Intern. kath. Zeitschrift 'Communio'* 9 (1980) 1–25, 135–47 and (in a fuller form) *The Atonement. The Origin of the Doctrine in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981). Particularly, the origin of 1 Cor 15. 3–5 in Hellenistic or Palestinian Jewish circles has been a matter of much debate. See the survey in John Kloppenborg 'An Analysis of the Pre-Pauline Formula 1 Cor 15:3b–5 in Light of some Recent Literature', *CBQ* 40 (1978) 351–67 who arrives at the conclusion that the formula came from the Palestinian Church, but took final shape in a Jewish-Hellenistic milieu (p. 357). It may be doubted whether the evidence allows a clear conclusion.
- [16] See, e.g. W. Grundmann, *TWNT* 9 (1973) 485 and C. F. D. Moule's remark: 'in secular Greek, *christos* is applied to ointment, never, it seems, to the one anointed: it means 'for external application' or 'externally applied' as against something that is drunk and used internally', *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge: CUP, 1977) 32 n. 37.
- [17] *Christos*, §§10–14. [18] See *Christos*, §14.
- [19] See esp. verse 13 with formulations which presuppose that 'Christ died for you', that baptism is a baptism *εἰς χριστόν*, and that (those who belong to) Christ cannot be divided.
- [20] See esp. verses 12–13; cf. 1 Cor 10. 1–5.
- [21] Rom 6. 1–11, cf. also Col 2. 12–13; 3. 1–4. See also the corporate language in Rom 8. 9–11; 2 Cor 5. 14–15 and cf. 2 Tim 2. 11–12.
- [22] On this see e.g. H. D. Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 181–5.
- [23] In chapter 5 'Ritual' of his *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1983) W. A. Meeks has rightly emphasized that 'ritual communicates the fundamental beliefs and values of a society or a group' and that 'ritual did not merely encode ideas that could be expressed otherwise, rather it *created* the essential categories of human thought' (p. 141). On baptism see pp. 150–7.
- [24] In his *The Origin of Christology* C. F. D. Moule devotes a long chapter to 'The Corporate Christ' (51–96). See also W. Kramer, *Christos*, §26 on *ἐν χριστῷ*.
- [25] Cf. 1 Cor 1. 12; 3. 23; 15. 23; 2 Cor 10. 7; Gal 3. 29; 5. 24 and Mark 9. 41. See also W. Kramer, *Christos*, §33 '“Christos” in Bezeichnungen des Einzelnen und der Gemeinde'.

[26] *χριστιανός* is also used in Acts 26. 28; 1 Pet 4. 16. See the convenient survey of early evidence by G. Schneider, Art. *χριστιανός* in *EWNT* 3 (1983) 1145–7. Schneider says: 'Der Name setzt voraus, dass man im Christus-Bekenntnis das Charakteristikum der Jesuanhänger erkannte' (1146). Acts connects the origin of the term with the origin of the first important community of followers of Jesus from the Jews and Gentiles. Because we do not have any early mention of the term we are not in a position to say with certainty whether its information rests on facts. The scarcity of the term in the writings of the NT will point to the fact that it was a name used by outsiders rather than by the 'Christians' themselves. But these outsiders must have used some designation as soon as the 'Jesus-group' was no longer in some way connected with the local synagogue – and in view of the early prominence of the designation *χριστός* in the group's preaching and teaching the term 'Christian' may be early also.

[27] Originally published in German 'Der gekreuzigte Messias' in H. Ristow and K. Matthiae (ed) *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1960) 149–69. See now *The Crucified Messiah and other Essays*, 10–36.

[28] 'The Crucified Messiah', 34.

[29] 'The Crucified Messiah', 32.

[30] All these quotations from 'The Crucified Messiah', 33.

[31] 'The Crucified Messiah', 32.

[32] See my 'The use of Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ' (listed in n. 35 below), 189: 'There is no reason to doubt that Jesus was crucified and that he was sentenced to death because the Romans regarded him as a dangerous political rebel. But we cannot take for granted that the actual accusation 'King of the Jews' was used at the trial before the Roman governor'.

[33] See e.g. R. Pesch's picture of Mark in his *Das Markus-evangelium* I–II (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1976–7). See esp. his essay on 'Die vormarkinische Passionsgeschichte' in II, 1–27 and the criticism it provoked, see e.g., that of F. Neirynck in three articles now brought together in his *Evangelica* (BETHL 60, Leuven: Peeters/Leuven UP, 1982) 493–564 (on the passion story see 527–46).

For a survey of recent studies on the relation between tradition and redaction in the Markan passion narrative, see Frank J. Matera, *The Kingship of Jesus. Composition and Theology in Mark 15* (SBL DissSer 66; Chico: Scholars, 1982) 1–5. Matera himself emphasizes the importance of Mark's redaction. '... we cannot exclude that Mark had some kind of passion tradition before him, but it does appear that the *present form* of the passion narrative, as we find it in the second gospel, is very much the result of Mark's redactional activity. ... Mark was constrained by the logic of the events (hearing, crucifixion, death, burial), but within that logic of events he effected an arrangement of material which reflected more than an historical report' (p. 60).

[34] For a judicious assessment of the achievements of the 'Formgeschichte' and some remarks on the relation between 'synchronic' and 'diachronic' reading of a text, see F. Hahn's concluding essay 'Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. Voraussetzungen, Ausbau und Tragweite' in F. Hahn (ed), *Zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Wege der Forschung 81; Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchgesellschaft, 1985) 427–77.

[35] *De Toekomstverwachting in de Psalmen van Salomo* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965); 'The Use of the Word "Anointed" in the Time of Jesus', *NT* 8 (1966) 132–48; 'The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future according to the Qumran Scrolls' in O. Michel ed., *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969) 44–63; (together with A. S. van der Woude) '11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament' *NTS* 12 (1965–6), 301–26 and 'Messianische Vorstellungen im Spätjudentum', *TWNT* 9 (1973) 500–18, esp. pp. 502–8 and 511–2; 'Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes', *Josephus-Studien. Fs. O. Michel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1974) 205–19; 'Jewish Expectations about the "Messiah" according to the Fourth Gospel', *NTS* 19 (1972–3) 246–70; 'The use of Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ in the Passion Narratives', in J. Dupont ed., *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (BETHL 40; Gembloux/Leuven: J. Duculot/Leuven UP, 1975) 169–92; 'The use of the expression *ὁ χριστός* in the Apocalypse of John' in J. Lambrecht ed., *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (BETHL 53; Gembloux/Leuven: J. Duculot/Leuven UP, 1980) 267–81 and 'Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?' (forthcoming).

[36] See J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (SNTS Mon. Ser. 54; Cambridge: CUP, 1985) 111–9.

[37] I take up here a number of points discussed in my 'The Use of Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ in the Passion Narratives' (mentioned in n. 35), esp. pp. 173–82. For an interesting and new attempt to describe and analyse Mark's christology see J. D. Kingsbury, *The Christology of Mark's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983). He sets himself the task 'not to read the gospel in the light of a reconstruction of

pre-markan traditions or of the alleged heresy of the Markan Church, but to follow the contours of Mark's story' (p. 45). He consistently argues on the level of the overall story which he describes as the gradual unfolding of the secret of Jesus' identity. Kingsbury admits the usefulness of a tradition-critical approach; he rightly emphasizes: 'The art of approaching a document with such a tradition-critical scheme, however, consists in not permitting the scheme to predetermine the message of the document' (p. 43). Scholars will do well to go all the way with him, before asking again what christology (or christologies) Mark presupposed in early Christianity and how these christologies and his own relate to Jewish notions about the Messiah, Son of God etc.

[38] This is true, whether this verse serves as the title of the gospel, or simply introduces its content. See the discussion of the problem in R. Pesch, *Das Markus-evangelium* I, 74-7. The longer text, with *υἱοῦ θεοῦ*, if not original, shows a clear insight into the christological emphasis of the gospel.

[39] See the studies of Dahl and Kramer mentioned in notes 1 and 2 above.

[40] See section 1.1.3. above.

[41] The addition *τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι* in 1. 34 in some MSS is clearly influenced by Luke 4. 41.

[42] See also 4.1, 26, 30 (in the chapter on the parables); 9. 47; 10. 14, 15, 23-25 (on entry into the Kingdom of God cf. 12. 34; 15. 43); 9. 1 (the Kingdom of God 'in power', cf. 14. 25).

[43] See 1. 7-8, 14-15; 8. 27-29 (and 6. 14-16); 9. 11-13 (Elijah has come as John the Baptist); 11. 27-33.

[44] This is rightly emphasized by J. D. Kingsbury, *Christology*, 60-8. Jesus is the beloved i.e. the unique Son of God (cf. 9. 7; 12. 6). There is no direct link with the use of *χριστός* in 1.1. The close connection between 'Son of God' and *χριστός*/'Son of David' only becomes evident as Mark's story progresses. 'Son of God' and *χριστός* are used in connection with kings from the house of David in texts which have influenced the expectation of a future ideal king (for 'Son of God' see 2 Sam 7. 14; Ps 2. 7; 89. 27-28). See F. J. Matera, *The Kingship of Jesus*, esp. pp. 75-8; 140-5 and also H. Merkley, 'Die Auferweckung Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie (Messias bzw. Sohn Gottes und Menschensohn)', *ZNW* 72 (1981) 1-26, esp. p. 9 and n. 34.

[45] 1. 21-22, 27; 2. 7; 4. 41; 6. 2-3 (cf. 11. 8).

[46] In 6. 14 some say 'John the Baptist has been revived from the dead; that is why these powers are at work in him.' This leads Herod to the remark: 'John, whom I beheaded, has been raised.' He is clearly wrong; in the following verses 6. 17-29 the evangelist tells the story of John's execution and burial. 6. 14, 16 are important proof-texts in K. Berger's theory that there existed a Jewish expectation concerning eschatological prophets who are killed by their adversaries and raised by God. See his *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes* (WUNT 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976) 17-22. See also R. Pesch, *Das Markus-evangelium* I, 332-7.

[47] 3. 11; 5. 7; cf. 1. 24 (*ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ*) and 1. 34 'because they knew him'; 3. 11 and 1. 34 are found in summaries. J. D. Kingsbury aptly speaks of a 'contrapuntal pattern of demonic cry and human question, of (suppressed) knowledge and ignorance ...' (*Christology*, 87).

[48] Jesus' forthcoming death is mentioned alone in 9. 12; 14. 21.

[49] On this see, particularly, Kingsbury's chapter 4 'The christology of Mark: The Son of Man', 157-73. In the present context the much-debated problem of the original use and meaning of 'Son of Man' (probably by Jesus himself) cannot be treated. The fact that we always find the same Greek *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* with a clear messianic meaning is regarded by M. Hengel as an indication of the fact that the Jesus tradition was translated into Greek at one place and at one time. He attributes it to the activity of the Greek-speaking Jews from the diaspora in Jerusalem (cf. Acts 7. 56!). See his 'Zwischen Jesus und Paulus', 202-3.

[50] On this pericope, 11. 1-11 and 12. 35-37 see my 'The use of Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ' 180-1, using K. Berger, 'Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments', *NTS* 20 (1973-74) 1-44, esp. pp. 3-9 which gives much attention to Solomonic 'Son of David' traditions. I hesitate now to connect Jesus' concern for the temple in 11. 15-17 and the reference to his rebuilding of the temple (14. 58-59 - a false accusation, according to Mark!) with the Solomonic 'Son of David' tradition. Mark, certainly, does not make this connection. Cf. D. Juel, *Messiah and Temple* (SBL Diss. Ser. 31; Missoula: Scholars, 1977) and D. Lüthmann, 'Markus 14.55-64: Christologie und Zerstörung des Tempels im Markusevangelium', *NTS* 27 (1980-81) 457-74.

[51] In contrast to Matt 21. 1-9 which speaks of 'crowds' and Luke 19. 28-40 which mentions 'the whole multitude of the disciples' Mark's *πολλοί* is not very specific. But he seems to refer to the disciples and a wider group which joins them.

[52] See D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand, Psalm 110 in early Christianity* (SBL Mon. Ser. 18; Nashville - New York: Abingdon, 1973); M. Gourgues, *À la Droite de Dieu, Résurrection de Jésus et actualisation du Psaume 110:1 dans le Nouveau Testament* (Paris: Gabalda, 1978).

[53] On this pericope see my 'The use of *Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ*', 181-2, and now also J. D. Kingsbury, *Christology*, 108-14 who concludes: 'The title that Mark does want the reader to infer as the counterpart to "Son of David" in 12. 35-37 is "Son of God" (p. 112).' Cf. my own conclusion in the article just mentioned. We should stress, however, that it is only the wider context in Mark which allows us to draw this conclusion. An interesting parallel may be supplied by the much-discussed pre-pauline formula used in Rom 1. 2-4.

[54] Compare my 'The Use of *Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ*', 174-6. J. D. Kingsbury, *Christology*, 118-24 sees a close connection with 12. 1-12. See also his paraphrase of 14. 62 on p. 124: 'Yes, I am the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed; and because you (the high priest) have asked me who I am in order to condemn me to death (cf. 14. 55), it will be in my (prophesied) role as the man who will have been vindicated by God by being exalted to universal rule and appointed to exercise final judgment that you (the high priest and Sanhedrin) will see me at the end of time.' Note that in 11. 10 the disciples (together with others) acclaim 'The coming Kingdom of our father David!'

[55] See for details my 'The Use of *Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ*', 176-9; Mark does not tell his readers who Pilate is, why he uses the term 'The King of the Jews', during which insurrection (*ἐν τῇ στάσει* verse 7) Barabbas was arrested. They are also expected to know who Alexander and Rufus are (verse 21). In the article just mentioned I conjectured that Mark inserted an originally independent story in his narrative. This may be so, but it does not explain why Mark does not redact it more thoroughly.

[56] Mark, therefore, puts much emphasis on the title which, as he assumes, his readers will immediately connect with that of 'the Messiah, Son of God' in 14. 61. Jesus is crucified as 'King of the Jews' by Pilate who is not at all convinced that he is such a king, at the instigation of the Jewish leaders who do not believe Jesus' real claim and distort his interpretation of the title 'Messiah'. Mark seems to assume that his readers are familiar with this gross misinterpretation by the Jewish leaders and the Roman governor of the real aims of Jesus the Christ in whom they believe. It must have been a burning question at the time the gospel of Mark was written. See also the conclusion of F. J. Matera: 'Our study suggests that Mark and his community may have been besieged by opponents who argued that Jesus did not fulfill the messianic expectations of the Old Testament. Kingship seems to have been intensely important to Mark, and one of his problems was to explain how the King of Israel could be a crucified Messiah.' (*The Kingship of Jesus*, 150-1)

[57] This is brought out very well by J. D. Kingsbury, *Christology*, 131-7.

[58] In 'The Use of *Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ*', 190-1 (following a suggestion by K. Berger) I pointed out the parallels between Mark's picture in chapter 15 and that of Paul in 1 Cor 1. 18-31 (cf. 15. 24-25; when Paul speaks about Christ's *βασιλεύειν* he means his future kingship). See also K. Berger, 'Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel', 398-9.

[59] In 14. 64 (cf. 15. 29-32) Jesus is, ironically (so also J. D. Kingsbury, *Christology*, 120-1), accused of *βλασφημία*. For the meaning in Mark see 2. 7; 3. 28-29. In 'The Use of *Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ*', 176, I concluded: 'For Mark the charge of *βλασφημία* was connected with Jesus' claim to divinely inspired authority, rooted in his special relationship with God'. In 14. 65 Jesus is mocked by the members of the Sanhedrin who ask him to prophesy. In Mark's picture of events Jesus, also after he has publicly accepted the designation Messiah, remains a divinely appointed prophetic figure - whose claim is not accepted, but nevertheless perceived by his adversaries.

[60] Cf. 8. 35; 10. 29; 13. 10; 14. 9. On the traditional pre-Pauline use of the expression *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ χριστοῦ* see section 1.1.3. above.

[61] In the parallel 13. 5, 6 the deceivers are people who come in Jesus' name, saying: 'I am he!' Verse 21 may refer to the same people, or alternatively, to a wider group of preachers to be connected or identified with the *ψευδοχριστοὶ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται*. The sense of the warning in verse 21 is the same in both cases. We should note that Mark 13 envisages a situation of confusion, in which false messiahs and prophets constitute a real threat to the Christian community (note the *εἰ δυνατόν* in verse 22!). In passing, we should note that also here the terms 'messiah' and 'prophet' are connected.

[62] Significantly, in 13. 32 Jesus uses the designation 'the Son' (and 'the Father' cf. 14. 36).

[63] Here I take up a number of points discussed at some length in the sessions of the Pseud-epigrapha Seminar at Durham in 1979 (see n. 36 above).

[64] On this see also my article 'Jewish Expectations about the "Messiah" according to the Fourth Gospel', *NTS* 19 (1972-3) 246-70.

- [65] See A. S. van der Woude – M. de Jonge, *TWNT* 9 (1973) 500–1 (the English equivalent in *TDNT* 9 (1974) 509–10).
- [66] A term used by G. W. E. Nickelsburg and M. E. Stone in their *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 161–202.
- [67] See A. Gelin, 'Messianisme' in *DBS* 5, Paris: Letouzey et Ané (1957) 1165–1212, esp. col. 1190–92: 'Le messianisme sans Messie: thème de Yahweh-Roi'. The fact that the terms 'messianism' and 'messianic' have long been taken over by historians of religion and cultural anthropologists does not offer an excuse for unclear use of these terms by biblical scholars. Here also Kyung Hee Kim, *Die Bezeichnung Jesu als (O) ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ. Ihre Herkunft und ursprüngliche Bedeutung* (Diss. Theol. Marburg: 1981) should be mentioned. The author restricts her NT material to the passages where *ὁ χριστός* is actually used, but when she compares it with OT and contemporary Jewish passages illustrating 'die religiöse Entwicklung der Messiasanschauung im zeitgenössischen Judentum' (191) she does not observe a comparable restriction. 'Messiasanschauung' covers more than the use of the term 'anointed'. This inconsistency of approach affects the cogency of the argument and the conclusions of the book.
- [68] See, e.g. F. Hesse, B 'משיח ומשיח' im Alten Testament' in *TWNT* 9 (1973) 485–500 and A. S. van der Woude, 'CII Septuaginta' *ibidem* 501–2.
- [69] Referring to the patriarchs mentioned in verses 12–15.
- [70] See my 'The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future according to the Qumran Scrolls', 50–1.
- [71] CD 12. 23–24; 14. 19; 19. 10–11; 20. 1.
- [72] Which seems likely, see my 'The Role of Intermediaries', 53–8.
- [73] See IQM 11. 7–8; CD 2. 12 and CD 5. 21–6. 1. In the last two texts one should read משיח' for משיחו' (see my 'The Use of the Word Anointed in the Time of Jesus', 141 n. 2). One of the principal tasks of the prophets was to endorse and to expound what Moses had said. But we also read that the prophets proclaim what God's future dealings with his people will be ('The Role of Intermediaries', 55). In 4QTest 5–8 a quotation from Deut 18. 18–19 (on the prophet like Moses!) precedes Num 24. 15–17 and Deut 33. 8–11. The sect follows the interpretation of the Teacher of Righteousness (priest and prophet!) 'bis auf bessere Belehrung', i.e. until yet a further stage is reached in God's dealings with Israel. This may point to a primarily teaching function of the prophet in 1QS 9. 11 (cf. 1 Macc 4. 16; 16. 41). Compare also the article by F. García Martínez, 'Profeet en Profetie in de Dode-Zee rollen', to be published in *Profeten en profetische geschriften. Studies aangeboden aan dr. A. S. van der Woude* (Nijkerk/Kampen: Callenbach/Kok, 1986).
- [74] See M. de Jonge and A. S. van der Woude, '11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament', 304–8. The content of the good news in Isa 52. 7 is מלך אלהים (probably referring to Melchizedek). Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975) 265–8, continues: 'concerning whom Dan[iel] said [Until an anointed one, a prince (Dan 9. 25)], following a suggestion by J. A. Fitzmyer, 'Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11', originally in *JBL* 86 (1967) 25–41, now in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Missoula: Scholars, 1974) 245–67.
- [75] See my *De Toekomstverwachting in de Psalmen van Salomo*, 14–23 and 'The Use of the Word Anointed in the time of Jesus', 133–7 (both publications contain further details about the stereotyped use of the word *χριστός* in PsSol 18).
- [76] On *χριστός κύριος* as the probable original reading, see *De Toekomstverwachting*, n. 41 and 'The Use of the Word Anointed', 134, n. 2. The king is called 'Son of David' in verse 21 – but again this is a qualification and not a title: 'Behold, O Lord, and raise up onto them their King, the Son of David . . . to rule over Israel, your servant.'
- [77] In the present context I cannot dwell on this problem, nor on that of the date of the Parables.
- [78] See, e.g. the variations between the versions in 4 Ezra 7. 28, 29 and possible Christian influence in SBar 30. 1–2. Note that all MSS of PsSol read *χριστός κύριος* in 17. 32 (see also n. 76 above).
- [79] See W. Staerk, *Altjüdische Liturgische Gebete* (Kleine Texte 58; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1930) 11–14 who gives the form of the text found in a Genizah fragment, published by S. Schechter, *JQR* 10 (1898) 654–9. The date and the exact wording of this recension are difficult to establish (see e.g. A. S. van der Woude, *TWNT* 9 (1973) 512–13). Note the fifteenth Benediction of the 'Babylonian Recension': 'Speedily cause the Shoot of David, Thy servant, to shoot up and raise up his horn through thy salvation.' וְקַרְנֵהוּ תְּרוֹם בְּיִשְׁעֶךָ God is

praised as He 'who causes the horn of salvation to shoot up' *שֹׁמֵר קֶרֶן יְשׁוּעָה* (text Staerk p. 18; trs. D. C. Duling, 'The Promises of David and their Entrance into Christianity - Nailing down a Likely Hypothesis', *NTS* 20 (1973-4) 55-78, esp. pp. 63-4; see also v.d.W.) We may note the parallel with Qumran in the use of *דָּוִד* (see 3.4.3.2.) and with Hebr. Sirach 51,12⁸ (cf. Ps 132. 17: 'There I will make a horn to sprout for David, I have prepared a lamp for my anointed').

[80] See my 'Josephus und die Zukunfterwartungen seines Volkes', esp. pp. 216-9. In n. 32 on p. 216 I also pointed to a group of three people mentioned in BJ 2.56-65; Ant 17.271-84 as operating in the time of Archelaos: Judas B. Hiskia, Simon, Athrongaios. On Menahem see BJ 2.433-48; on Simon bar Giora BJ 4.503-44; 556-84; 7.26-36; 153-7.

[81] See BJ 2.258-63; Ant 20. 167-72; Ant 20. 97-9; 18: 85-7.

[82] *CBQ* 46 (1984) 471-95.

[83] 'Popular Messianic Movements', 494-5.

[84] 'Popular Messianic Movements', 471. Compare also H. G. Kippenberg, 'Wo war im Judentum des zweiten Tempels die Hoffnung auf einen davidischen Messias verbreitet?', to be published in *Profeten en profetische geschriften* (see n. 73).

[85] See also M. A. Chevallier, *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958). So also M. Hengel, 'Jesus als messianischer Lehrer und die Anfänge der Christologie' in *Sagesse et Religion (Colloque de Strasbourg, octobre 1976)* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1979) 148-88, esp. 166-80.

[86] On the following see the interesting article by J. A. Fitzmyer, 'David, "Being Therefore a Prophet . . ." (Acts 2.30)', *CBQ* 34 (1972) 332-9 and my 'Jezus als profetische Zoon van David', to be published in *Profeten en profetische geschriften* (see n. 73).

[87] Cf. Acts 28. 25; see also Ep.Barn. 12. 10; Justin, Dial. 34. 1; 87. 4.

[88] LXX: *ὁ δὲ ἀνέστησεν κύριος ἐνὶ χροσδὸν θεοῦ* 'τακῶβ.

[89] Trs. H. St. J. Thackeray/R. Marcus in *Josephus V* (LCL edition 1934).

[90] The Spirit is not mentioned, but the text says: 'et erat Dominus cum eo ex illo die'.

[91] See J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPsa)* (DJD 4; Oxford: OUP, 1965) 91-3. Sanders comments: 'David is credited with the divine gift of prophecy (line 11) in composing his psalms and songs. Several of the attributes of David listed in lines 2-4 are found in 2 Sam 23. 1-7, which immediately precedes in Cols xxvi and xxvii line 1, or in 2 Sam 22 (Ps 18) which was surely included in the early columns of 11QPsa . . .'

[92] In a note on p. 93 J. A. Sanders remarks that Ps 91 was known as *שִׁיר הַפְּנוּטִים* in Judaism. See also: J. P. M. van der Ploeg O.P. 'Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes (11QPsa⁸)' in *Tradition und Glaube (Fs. K. G. Kuhn)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971) 128-39. On p. 128 he writes: 'Nombre d'expressions suggèrent que les psaumes ont contenu des imprécations contre les démons tout comme le Ps XCI qui termine la petite collection et qui a été employé dans le Judaïsme comme moyen de défense contre les démons.' Cf. J. P. M. van der Ploeg, 'Le Psaume XCI dans une recension de Qumrân', *RB* 72 (1965) 210-7.

[93] L. Fisher, 'Can This be the Son of David?' in *Jesus and the Historian (Fs. E. C. Colwell)* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968) 82-97; K. Berger, 'Die königlichen Messias-traditionen des Neuen Testaments', 1-44, esp. §1 "'Sohn Davids'" bezeichnet den Messias als Exorzisten und Wundertäter' (pp. 3-9); E. Lövestam, 'Jésus Fils de David chez les Synoptiques', *Studia Theologica* 28 (1974) 97-109; D. C. Duling, 'Solomon, Exorcism and the Son of David', *HThR* 68 (1975) 235-52; see also his 'The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic', *NTS* 24 (1978) 392-410.

[94] See pp. 249-52. He rightly warns against the use of verbal parallels from the Testament of Solomon. 'Only in the *Testament of Solomon* is Solomon addressed as "Son of David" as Jesus is addressed in the gospels. My impression is that such references are dependent on the NT even though the NT and the *Testament of Solomon* are only orally related.'

[95] See p. 252. Fisher, Lövestam and Berger point to Matt 12. 22-42 as indication for acquaintance with the Solomon tradition.

[96] *NTS* 8 (1961-2) 101-16.

[97] P. 113.

[98] P. 114. He includes a reference to Josephus, Ant 6.166-168, but does not note the exorcistic element in it; but on pp. 112-13 he mentions Solomon's exorcistic abilities described in Ant 8. 45. 'Solomon was notorious for his victories over demonic powers which were still gained in his name during the N.T. period. Would the great Son of David, the Messiah, be less powerful?'

[99] See M. de Jonge – A. S. van der Woude, '11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament' esp. the section 'The use of Isa LII.7 and LXI.1 f. in the New Testament', 309–12.

[100] See G. Friedrich, art. *εὐαγγελίζομαι* κτλ. *TWNT* 2 (1935) 705–35; P. Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinische Evangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1968) and K. Berger, 'Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel', 393–9. Berger's thesis: 'Der Begriff "Evangelium Jesu Christi" kennzeichnet speziell die prophetische Botschaft Jesu insofern sie zur Erkenntnis Gottes führen will; zur Gen. obj. – Verbindung konnte es deshalb kommen, weil auch das Auferwecktsein als entscheidender Grund für die Bekehrung zu Gott angesehen werden konnte' (p. 396) cannot be substantiated; *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ χριστοῦ* is a traditional expression in which *χριστός* as the core of what is believed and proclaimed in the gospel refers to the formulas about the death and resurrection of Jesus (see section 1.1.3. above). In the lines just quoted and in his statement 'Der Titel *Christos* begegnet ferner häufig allgemein in Aussagen über Tod und Auferstehung Jesu. Man kann zeigen, dass die Aussage über die Auferstehung Jesu in einer Tradition über Martyrium und Auferstehung von Propheten beheimatet ist' (p. 399) Berger refers to his *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes* (see n. 46 above). I do not think that Berger has succeeded in demonstrating that 'In eben dieser Tradition werden auch Propheten bzw. der endzeitliche Prophet als Gesalbte verstanden (Apc 11.4)' (p. 399).

[101] *χριστός* is never used in Q.

[102] Here I disagree with J. D. Kingsbury, *Christology* 66. M. Hengel, 'Jesus als messianischer Lehrer . . .', after paying due attention to the influence of Isa 11. 1–5 on the Jewish expectations of the Messiah (see n. 85), yet regards the prophetic Messiah/the Anointed with the Spirit as the earliest 'model' to explain Jesus' ministry as teacher, and eschatological representative of Wisdom. In a way which differs from 11Q Melch, early Christian christology after Easter identifies 'the earthly messianic teacher' and 'God's heavenly redeemer' (see pp. 181–4). One would welcome further argumentation for this hypothetical reconstruction.

JESUS' DEATH FOR OTHERS AND THE DEATH OF THE MACCABEAN MARTYRS

During the last four years research in the small New Testament section of the Leiden Faculty of Theology has centered around Jewish and Christian ideas about martyrdom. This research has by no means come to an end, and is not directly concerned with the various interpretations of Jesus' death found in the writings of Early Christianity. Yet the invitation to contribute a short paper to the Jubilee volume in honour of our good friend and colleague A.F.J. Klijn presents a welcome opportunity to report briefly on the implications of the research carried on so far for a better understanding of the views on Jesus' death for others among the first Christians¹.

Paul spoke for many when he wrote to the Corinthians that the message of the crucified Messiah was 'a stumbling block to Jews and a folly to Gentiles' (1 Cor 1,23). And not only in their preaching to outsiders, but also in their teaching within the Christian communities, in their discussions about the enduring value and meaning of Jesus' mission and their liturgical celebrations, the early Christians tried to find an explanation for their master's ignominious death on the cross. Meditating on texts and traditions about the suffering, death and vindication of servants of God and righteous persons in the past, they came up with various interpretations² — always, of course, linking Jesus' death implicitly or explicitly with his victory over death, his resurrection and exaltation. Only the firm conviction that God had vindicated this unique envoy of God, who had appeared at the turn of the times to announce and to inaugurate God's sovereign rule on earth, made it possible to continue believing the truth of his

1. So far the only major study that has appeared is J.W. van Henten, *De joodse martelaren als grondleggers van een nieuwe orde* (Diss. Leiden 1986). For 1988 are expected J.W. van Henten c.s. (edd.), *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (to be published by E.J. Brill, Leiden, in the series *Studia Post-Biblica*) and Marinus de Jonge, *Christology in Context* (to be published by Westminster Press, Philadelphia). The first of these two books gives a revised version of the papers presented at a Symposium held at Leiden in September 1984 with a full report on the discussions. The present paper represents the author's assessment of the evidence, but it owes much to the work done by others and has benefited from many discussions with colleagues at the Symposium and at other occasions. For the views expressed here see also chapter 11 of *Christology in Context*.
2. This is brought out very clearly by M.L. Gubler, *Die frühesten Deutungen des Todes Jesu. Eine motivgeschichtliche Darstellung aufgrund der neueren exegetischen Forschung* (Oriens Biblicalis et Orientalis 15; Freiburg/Göttingen 1977) and G. Friedrich, *Die Verkündigung des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament* (Biblich-Theologische Studien 6; Neukirchen/Vluyn 1982).

message and to keep searching for the salvific meaning of his death.

It is generally accepted that a very early stage *Jesus' death was seen as that of an envoy of God rejected by Israel*. We find this view in the Q-texts Luke 11,49-51 par.; Matt 23,34-36; Luke 13,34-35 par.; Matt 23,37-39, in Mark 12,1-9 and in 1 Thess 2,14-16. It links up with Jewish notions concerning Israel's reaction to the prophets in the context of a deuteronomistic view of history³. What (the leaders of) Israel did to Jesus — and are doing to Jesus' followers — forms the climax in a tradition of stubborn opposition against God and against those sent by God to remind Israel of its obligations. Jesus is not just an envoy, but the final envoy; Paul calls him 'the Lord' (1 Thess 2,15); in the Markan parable he is the son of the owner of the vineyard (Mark 12,6). The point of no return has been reached, the measure is full, God's punishment is inevitable (Luke 11,50-51; 1 Thess 2,16).

In this model of interpretation the emphasis is on the responsibility of the persecutors rather than on the fate of the envoys. Also nothing is said about the vindication of the messengers by God. We may note that after 12,1-9 Mark quotes Ps 118,22-23 in order to refer to Jesus' resurrection (compare Acts 4,11). In the contrast-pattern employed in the speeches in Acts (2,23-24.36; 3,13-15; 4,10; 5,30-31; 10,39-40; 13,27-31) that also emphasizes the responsibility of Israel's leaders for Jesus' death, the reference to the cross is followed by a resurrection formula⁴. In both instances, however, Jesus' death is the negative counterpart of God's vindication. No positive meaning is attached to his death as such.

Much has been written lately about *the conception of Jesus as God's suffering righteous servant*⁵. Many passages in the Old Testament (particularly the Book of Psalms) and in early Jewish literature describe how God in his righteousness comes to the rescue of his faithful servants in distress, oppression or poverty, who continue to expect everything from him. In many of these passages the deliverance brought about by God takes place during the earthly life of those who are oppressed and/or have to suffer. In the stories of the three young men in the fiery furnace in Daniel 3 (expanded in the Greek Bible) and of Daniel himself in the lion's den in Daniel 6 the protagonists are ready to die a

3. See O.H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23; Neukirchen/Vluyn 1967).

4. Here the initiative for Jesus' resurrection comes from God — just as in the pre-Pauline formulas found in Rom 4,24; 8,11; 10,9; 1 Cor 6,14; 15,15; 2 Cor 4,14; Gal 1,1; 1 Thess 1,10, cf. 1 Pet 1,21.

5. The leading studies are L. Ruppert, *Der leidende Gerechte. Eine motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten Testament und zwischentestamentlichen Judentum* (Forschung zur Bibel 5; Würzburg 1972); idem, *Der leidende Gerechte und seine Feinde. Eine Wortfelduntersuchung* (Würzburg 1973); idem, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte? Der Weg Jesu im Lichte eines alt- und zwischentestamentlichen Motivs* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 59; Stuttgart 1972) and K.Th. Klein-knecht, *Der leidende Gerechtfertigte* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/13; Tübingen 1984).

gruesome death rather than to disobey their God, but they are rescued at the crucial moment by angels sent by God. Nebuchadnezzar and Darius have to admit that the living God has rescued his servants who remained faithful to him (3,28; 6,25-27). In Dan 11,29-35 together with 12,1-3, a decisive further step is taken. Here God's vindication of the faithful who have endured the test takes the form of resurrection at his final intervention in the affairs of the world. In the apocalyptic world view which finds expression here the great persecution in the world will be followed by definitive deliverance for God's people (compare *I En.* 102-104 and *Syr. Apoc. Bar.* 48,48-50; 52,6-7). Similarly, in Daniel 7 'the one like a son of man', who stands for the saints of the Most High oppressed by 'the little horn' of the fourth beast (vv. 21,25), receives an everlasting kingdom.

This conception may be behind the earliest form of the predictions of Jesus' passion and resurrection in Mark 8,31; 9,31 and 10,32-34. Yet the striking difference is that Jesus' resurrection does not form part of the general resurrection. While his resurrection shows that God is on his side and that his announcement of the speedy final breakthrough of God's kingdom remains valid, there remains an interval: Jesus as 'the Son of man' is 'sitting at the right hand of Power' but only later will he be 'coming with the clouds of heaven' (Mark 14,62, compare 9,1; 13,26-27)⁶.

In Mark's passion story the cry 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me' of Psalm 22,2 has received a prominent place (Mark 15,34 par.; Matt 27,46). There are more explicit and implicit references to Ps 22 and Ps 69 and other passages representing the various elements of the tradition of the suffering righteous in the immediate and more remote context⁷. It has rightly been argued that Mark was not the first to be influenced by this tradition. It is very likely that the use of Ps 22,2 is intended to suggest divine deliverance. Yet the hymns of praise in Ps 22,23-32 and Ps 69,31-37⁸ are nowhere referred to; in the Markan story it is the young man in the white robe of 16,7 who announces Jesus' resurrection as sign of his vindication by God. Important is the implicit reference to Wis 2,17-20 in Mark 15,29-32 (explicit in Matt 27,39-44), recalling the two related passages in Wis 2,12-20 and 5,1-7. The righteous man who is called a servant and even a son of God is condemned to death by his opponents, but vindicated by God; he is numbered among the sons of God while his

6. Very recently Dale C. Allison Jr. in his *The End of the Ages Has Come. An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus* (Philadelphia 1985/Edinburgh 1987) has argued that traditions that relate Jesus' death to the time of tribulation before the End (the Messianic woes) and portray his resurrection as inaugurating the general resurrection are very early. In connecting the pattern 'suffering-vindication' with interpretations of what happened and would happen to God's faithful collectively he underestimates the influence of traditions concerning God's vindication of suffering individuals.

7. R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium II* (Herders Theol. Komm. zum N.T. II/2; Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1977) 13-15 has brought together all that can possibly be regarded as a reference to or reminiscence of *passio iusti* traditions in Mark.

8. We should note that Ps 22,23-32 ends with an outlook on God's rule over all the nations, acclaimed by the ends of the earth, and that Ps 69,35-37 connects God's help for the poor and oppressed with his salvation for Zion and Judah — worthy of the praise of the entire creation.

opponents stand condemned (see also Mark 14,62).

For the early Christians Jesus was not just a righteous man or a son of God, but *the* Son of God. God had delivered him from suffering and death by raising and exalting him; God's sovereign rule would be established on earth in the near future. But the tradition of God's vindication of his suffering servants in its various forms was an important help in explaining Jesus' fate, even though his relationship to God and his place in God's history with Israel and mankind were thought to be unique.

We shall now have to turn to the conception of *Jesus' death for others* which is very prominent in early formulations of the Christian faith⁹. We find the expression ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (or something similar) very often together with Χριστός as subject; here and elsewhere also ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν is found. The longer expression gives an explanation of the shorter one — Jesus died for those who sinned against God. Without going into details we may mention here Rom 5,6.8; 14,15; 1 Cor 8,11 (here the preposition διὰ is used); 15,3; 2 Cor 5,14.15; 1 Thess 5,10 (compare 1 Pet 2,21; 3,18 with the variant ἑπαθεν). The idea and the expression are implied in Rom 14,9; 1 Cor 1,13; 2 Cor 5,21; Gal 2,21; 3,13. As Paul's application of the formula in 2 Cor 5,14.15 (and Rom 6,2.8-10) shows, the leading idea is that of a close communion between Jesus Christ and those who belong to him, so that what happens to the one has its effects on those connected with him.

Related but different are the so-called surrender formulas, using the verbs παραδίδοναι or δίδοναι. In Rom 8,32 God is said to have given up his son for us; in the passive παρεδόθη in Rom 4,25 he is the implied subject. Elsewhere (Gal 1,4; 2,20; Eph 5,2.25) Jesus is said to have given himself for (the sins of) others. Again 'for us (etc.)' alternates with 'for our (etc.) sins'. There is a clear connection with more elaborate expressions. In Mark 10,45 (par. Matt 20,28) the Son of man is said to have come 'to give his life as a ransom (λύτρον) for (ἀντί) many'; 1 Tim 2,6 mentions Christ Jesus 'who gave himself as a ransom (ἀντὶ λύτρου) for all' and Tit 2,14 speaks of (Jesus Christ) 'who gave himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity' (compare the use of ἀπολύτρωσις in Rom 3,24 and elsewhere).

Thirdly, the expression ὑπὲρ πολλῶν/ὑμῶν is found in the traditions concerning the Last Supper¹⁰. The two oldest versions in the New Testament, those of

9. See W. Kramer, *Christos Kyrios Gottessohn. Untersuchungen zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den vorpaulinischen Gemeinden* (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 44; Zürich/Stuttgart 1963), §§ 2-8, 26 and K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (Studien zum Neuen Testament 7; Gütersloh 1972) 3-6. Compare also H. Riesenfeld, art. ὑπὲρ, *ThWNT* VIII, 510-518.

10. The literature on the Last Supper is vast. On 1 Cor 11,23-26 and parallels see now especially H.J. Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen N.F. 15; Münster 1982, ²1986) 297-323.

Mark 14,22-25 and 1 Cor 11,23-26, show differences. Mark 14,24 speaks of 'my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many', Paul connects 'for us' with the bread in v. 24 and speaks of 'this cup' as 'the new covenant in my blood'. Yet we may be sure that the liturgical tradition before Mark and before Paul contained the commemoration of Jesus' death for others and connected it with the idea of a new covenant established by God with those for whom Jesus died.

Against which background have the *ὑπέρ*-formulas connected with Jesus' death to be understood? Many scholars have pointed to Isa 52,13-53,12, the famous passage about the suffering servant of the Lord, and well-known interpreters of the New Testament like O. Cullmann, J. Jeremias and T.W. Manson argued that Jesus himself was deeply influenced by this Deutero-Isaianic concept¹¹. The ideas found in this passage (that, in view of 52,13-15 and 53,10-12, may be classified among those portraying a suffering righteous one) are unparalleled in the Old Testament¹² and its influence on early Jewish texts is negligible¹³. Many exegetes have also questioned its influence on early Christian conceptions about Jesus' death. Texts from Isa 52,13-53,12 are quoted in Matt 8,17; John 12,38; Rom 10,16; 15,21. But only in Luke 22,37 and Acts 8,32-35 the quotation is connected with Jesus' suffering, and 1 Pet 2,21-25 is the only instance where the expression 'Christ suffered for us' is explained with the help of a hymn giving a string of quotations from Isa 53.

Often the use of the term 'many' in Mark 10,45; 14,24 is thought to have been influenced by Isa 53,11,12, but it is very difficult to prove this conclusively¹⁴. Much more likely is the influence of Isa 53,12 LXX on Rom 4,25, but here the particular wording of the surrender formula and its combination with the reference to Jesus' resurrection 'for our justification' may well go back to Paul using old material for an *ad hoc* argument.

Another line of interpretation connects the conception of Jesus' death for

11. For details see H. Haag, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterjesaja* (Erträge der Forschung 233; Darmstadt 1985) 66-78; here also opinions to the contrary are summarized.
12. M. Hengel who in his *Atonement. A Study of the Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament* (London 1981) defends the thesis that the ideas of Isa 53 have exercised a great influence on the early Christian interpretations of Jesus' death, calls it an 'erratic block' (following K. Koch).
13. See e.g. E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht. Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments N.F. 46; Göttingen 1955, 1963) 104-111. Isa 52,13-53,12 has influenced *T. Benj.* 3,8 but this is a clearly Christian passage and can play no role in discussions on Jewish ideas about 'dying for others' and their possible influence on early Christian concepts — see my paper 'Test. Benjamin 3:8 and the picture of Joseph as a 'good and holy man'', in: J.W. van Henten c.s. (edd.), *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie*.
14. See e.g. S.K. Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event. The Background and Origin of a Concept* (Harvard Dissertations in Religion 2; Missoula MT 1975) 213-217. It is often maintained that 'many' (that is used inclusively) has a universal meaning. The 'for you' in 1 Cor 11,24 would then be a (later) liturgical narrowing down of a universal statement in Mark 14,24. But the word *πολλοί* as such does not necessarily have a universal meaning. At the background is the relation between 'the many' and 'the one', see C.K. Barrett, 'The Background of Mark 10:45', *New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson* (ed. A.J.B. Higgins; Manchester 1959) 1-18.

others with the 'binding of Isaac (for sacrifice)' in Genesis 22,1-19¹⁵. It is very likely that the expression 'who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for all', representing a special variant of the surrender formula, alludes to Gen 22,16. If so, it is Abraham's readiness to sacrifice his son that receives attention (compare Heb 11,17-19 and Jas 2,21). Nothing is said here about Isaac's readiness to be sacrificed, nor is this hinted at in the other surrender formulas. Moreover, the date of this Jewish tradition is disputed; the first datable passages relevant to this issue are from the latter part of the first or the beginning of the second century A.D. (see Ps. Philo, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 18,5; 32,2-4; 40,2; Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* 1, §§ 222-236; 4 Macc 13,12 (compare 7,14; 18,11)).

Much more light is shed on the conception of Jesus' death for others by the accounts of the deaths of Eleazar and those of the seven brothers and their mother in 2 Macc 6,18-31 and 2 Macc 7, and in 4 Macc 5-7 and 4 Macc 8-18. These accounts are part of Hellenistic-Jewish writings and are greatly influenced by Greek, Hellenistic and Roman ideas about dying for one's city and for friends, for the law and for truth, and about expiatory sacrifice to assuage the anger of the gods¹⁶. As M. Hengel has argued, this fact should not lead to drawing a sharp distinction between Hellenistic Judaism and Palestinian Judaism¹⁷. The efforts of 2 Maccabees (to be dated in or soon after 124 B.C.) and 4 Maccabees (perhaps as late as A.D. 100)¹⁸ to interpret incisive events in Jewish history — in this case the death of many law-abiding, righteous Israelites — with the help of Hellenistic conceptions, remain thoroughly Jewish if only because the Hellenistic ideas are imbedded in material found in the Law, the Prophets and many Writings and handed down and developed in Jewish tradition. It is equally one-sided and wrong to think that at the earliest stages of Christianity Palestinian Christians were exclusively influenced by Palestinian Jewish ideas, that only Greek-speaking, Hellenistic Christians assimilated Hellenistic(-Jewish) ideas, and that in the first century the Palestinian and Hellenistic congregations lived in relative separation¹⁹.

15. See M.L. Gubler, *Die frühesten Deutungen des Todes Jesu*, 336-375; M. Hengel, *The Atonement*, 61-63 and K.Th. Kleinknecht, *Der leidende Gerechtfertigte*, 159-163.

16. On this see M. Hengel, *The Atonement*, 4-32 and J.W. van Henten, *De joodse martelaren*, 129-130, 141-144, 158-169 referring (among others) to S.K. Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event*, chapter IV, 'Suffering and Death in Greek and Hellenistic Literature' and the forthcoming article by H.S. Versnel, 'Quid Athenis et Hierosolymis? Bemerkungen über die Herkunft von Aspekten des 'effective death'', in: J.W. van Henten c.s. (edd.), *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (the latest in a series of studies on self-sacrifice in the Hellenistic world by this author).

17. See his *The Atonement*, 2-4, 60-61 with reference to his *Judentum und Hellenismus* (Wiss. Untersuchungen zum N.T. 10; Tübingen 1969). In particular K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder*, 62-71 (criticizing E. Lohse) has distinguished sharply between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity.

18. See J.W. van Henten, *De joodse martelaren*, 57-58 and 187-191.

19. So again M. Hengel — see especially his 'Between Jesus and Paul' and 'Christology and New

In 2 and 4 Maccabees we find the expressions 'to die for' or 'to give one's life for' (ὕπερ, διὰ). In 2 Maccabees Eleazar is willing to die a good death 'for the revered and holy laws' (2 Macc 6,28), the seven brothers 'give up body and life for the laws of our fathers' (7,37, see also 7,9)²⁰. 2 Macc 6,30 speaks about suffering because one fears God (διὰ τὸν φόβον αὐτοῦ) and 7,32 has the expression 'suffering because of our own sins' (parallel: 'on our own account (δι' ἑαυτούς) because we have sinned against our God' in 7,18). In 4 Maccabees the martyrs are said to have died 'for the law' (6,27; 13,9 [13], compare 9,1), 'for virtue's sake' (1,8) or 'for goodness' sake' (1,10). We also find 'for the sake of their religion' (εὐσέβεια: 9,6; 18,3) and 'for the sake of God' (διὰ θεόν: 16,25, compare 9,8). The Maccabean martyrs are without any doubt righteous, virtuous people who fear God. That is why their obedience leading to martyrdom can bring about a turn in the fate of Israel. We cannot go into detail here, but should note the following points:

In 2 Macc 6,12-17, a typical redactional passage, the author assures his readers that the many calamities he narrates are not meant to destroy but to discipline Israel. Israel is punished immediately, whilst the nations are left to themselves 'until they have reached the full measure of their sins' (v. 14).

The martyrs share in the sins and the punishment of their people. We have just mentioned 7,18 and 32 where, no doubt, an inclusive 'we' is used. In 7,23 the youngest brother tells the tyrant: 'And if our living God is angry for a little while, to rebuke and discipline us, he will again be reconciled (καταλλαγήσεται) with his own servants'. Through the suffering of these exemplary servants of God, resulting in their death, God's wrath will come to an end. The last words of the seventh brother are a prayer for intercession in which he appeals to God 'to show mercy (ἴλεως γενέσθαι) even to our nation . . . and through me and my brothers to bring to an end the wrath of the Almighty which has justly fallen on our whole nation' (7,37-38). The martyrs die in solidarity with Israel as the people of God, because of their own sins and those of their people. The result of their death is that God is indeed reconciled with Israel²¹ and shows his mercy.

How this takes effect is told in 8,1-7, directly following on the accounts of the deaths of Eleazar and the seven brothers. Judas assembles an army of six thousand men, enlisting his kinsmen and those 'who had continued in the Jewish faith'. They pray God to have mercy and to come to the rescue. God acts indeed: 'As soon as Maccabeus got his army organized the Gentiles could not withstand him, for the wrath of God had turned to mercy' (v. 5)²².

Testament Chronology', now found in *Between Jesus and Paul. Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity* (London 1983).

20. Compare 1 Macc 2,50: 'show zeal for the Law and give your lives for the covenant of our fathers' and 3 Macc 1,23. See also 1 Macc 6,24, where a man dying in a suicide mission is praised because 'he gave his life to save his people'. Compare 2 Macc 8,21 where Judas asks his soldiers to be ready to die 'for their laws and their country' (compare 15,30).
21. Compare 2 Macc 1,5; 5,20; 8,29.
22. On all this see J. W. van Henten, *De joodse martelaren*, especially 117-136. See also his chapter 2: '2 Mak. 6,18-7,42 en 14,37-46 in de litteraire context van 2 Mak.' (10-58).

The conception found here may be compared with notions about non-cultic atonement by Moses (see Ex 32,30-34; Ps 106,16-23; compare 78,17-38) and Phinehas (Num 25; Sir 45,23; 1 Macc 5,24 and Ps 106,28-31)²³. Moses interceded for his people and was willing to share their fate; 'he stood in the breach before him, to turn away his wrath from destroying them' (Ps 106,23). Phinehas' punitive action in his zeal for the Lord 'made atonement for the people of Israel' (Num 25,13), that is: he turned back God's wrath from the people of Israel (v. 11). Another interesting parallel is found in Dan 3,38-40 LXX where Azariah, ready to be martyred, prays to God:

'... like holocausts of rams and bulls
like ten thousand of fat sheep,
so may our sacrifice be before you today,
to bring about atonement with you'²⁴.

Here the martyrs' self-sacrifice is clearly compared with the cultic sacrifices in the temple of Jerusalem²⁵.

Finally, one other important aspect of 2 Maccabees deserves attention. Much emphasis is laid on the resurrection of the martyrs (vv. 9.11.14.23.29.36) probably viewed as an eternal existence in a body in heaven. The tyrant will not escape punishment (vv. 17.19.31.34-37 and chapter 9); for the martyrs there will be resurrection to life, because God vindicates those who are faithful to him²⁶.

Turning briefly to 4 Maccabees, we notice that here the exemplary nature of their obedience to God and the divine award granted to them as well as to all true children of Abraham receives more emphasis than the consequences of their death for the land and the people.

In 18,1-2 the author (returning to the theme expressed in 1,1) exhorts his readers: 'O offspring of the seed of Abraham, children of Israel, obey this Law and be altogether true to your religion, knowing that devout reason is master over the passions, and not only over pains from within but also from outside ourselves'²⁷. In 18,6-19 we find the mother addressing her sons, reminding them of their father's teaching of the Law and the Prophets: 'He read to you of Abel, slain by Cain, of Isaac, offered as a burnt offering, and of Joseph in prison. He spoke to you of the zeal of Phinehas, Azariah and Mishael in the fire. He sang

23. So again J.W. van Henten, *De joodse martelaren*, 124-133.

24. The translation is that by M. Hengel, *The Atonement*, 61. Text (Theodotion differs) and translation present difficulties (see v. 40b ἐξλάσαι ὀπισθὲν σου).

25. We should note that only in the present context martyrdom and sacrifice are connected; v. 39a asks God: 'with a contrite heart and a humble spirit may we be accepted' — as 'there is no place to make an offering before God and to find mercy' (v. 38).

26. See J.W. van Henten, *De joodse martelaren*, 117-124 for details. We should note that in 2 Macc 15,12-16 Onias and Jeremiah are portrayed in heaven, praying for the Jews. See also the difficult passage 12,39-45 where the number of people expected to rise seems to include also non-martyrs.

27. Here and elsewhere I use the translation of H. Anderson in J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha II* (Garden City, New York 1985) 531-564.

the praises of Daniel in the lion's den and called him blessed' (vv. 11-13)²⁸. The father also quoted Isa 43,2; Ps 34,19; Prov 3,18; Ezek 37,3 and Deut 32,39 in order to prove that God does not leave his suffering servants alone but rewards them with true life. All those who serve God (martyrs, near-martyrs and people otherwise in distress) will have eternal life. The brothers are convinced: 'After our death in this fashion Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will receive us and all our fathers will praise us' (13,17; compare 16,25). But in 7,18.19 we hear that all 'who with all their heart make piety their first concern are able to conquer the passions of the flesh, believing that to God they do not die, as our patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob died not, but live to God'. The final verses, 18,23-24, give the picture of 'the sons of Abraham, together with their mother, who won the victor's prize' . . . 'gathered together in the choir of their fathers, having received pure and deathless souls from God, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen'.

In 18,3.4 the reward awarded to the martyrs is mentioned together with the effect of their death on the people and the land: 'Those men who surrendered their bodies to suffering for piety's sake were in return not only admired by mankind but were also deemed worthy of the divine portion. And it was because of them that our nation enjoyed peace — they revived the observance of the Law in their land and repulsed their enemies' siege'²⁹. (Verse 5 then mentions Antiochus' punishment.) In 6,27-29 Eleazar, before his death, prays: 'You know, God, that though I could have saved myself I am dying in these fiery torments for the sake of the Law (διὰ τὸν νόμον). Be merciful (ἰλεως γενοῦ) to your people and let our punishment be a satisfaction on their behalf (ἀρκισθεὶς τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δικῇ). Make my blood their purification (καθάρσιον αὐτῶν) and take my life as a ransom for theirs (ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν)'. The idea of purification is also found in 1,11, and especially in 17,21-22: ' . . . and the tyrant was punished and our land purified, since they became, as it were, a ransom for the sins of our nation (ἀντίψυχον . . . τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας). Through the blood of these righteous ones and through the propitiation of their death (τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν) the divine providence rescued Israel, which had been shamefully treated'.

Basically, the views on martyrdom in 2 and 4 Maccabees are the same. The violent death of exemplary servants of God restores the right relationship between God and his people, and makes it possible for Israel to live in peace again. The martyrs themselves are vindicated and exalted to live with God. There are differences in emphasis, as we have noted, and it is clear that the terminology in 4 Maccabees is more advanced. It stresses the idea of purification, introduces the expression ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, explained by the ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν and

28. Isaac is also mentioned and praised for his pious endurance in 7,14; 13,12; 16,20-21. Daniel and the three young men occur in 13,9; 16,3.21. The seven brothers are counted among the 'Ἀβραμαῖοι παῖδες (9,21; 18,23; compare 6,17.22 and the characterization of their mother in 6,17.22; 17,6; 18,21). Abraham himself is an example of bravery and fear of God (15,28; 16,20).

29. Alternative reading: 'and pillaged the enemies'.

by the notion of ransom for the sins of the people, and it uses the word *ἱλαστήριον*³⁰.

Together, 2 and 4 Maccabees³¹ help us to understand the conception of Jesus' 'death for others' found in early Christian confessional formulas and developed in various ways by early Christian writers³². Jesus' death brought about a new covenantal³³ relationship between God and those who put their trust in Jesus, and live in communion with him. A new 'pure' community, soon comprising Jews and Gentiles, had been established, because Jesus died / gave his life for them, that is: for their sins.

Again the model of interpretation reflected in these accounts of the Maccabean martyrs elucidates only certain aspects of Jesus' mission culminating in his death and resurrection. In his solidarity with others, Jesus died for *their* sins, and not for his own³⁴. He was not just a martyr bringing about reconciliation with God and peace for Israel on earth. He appeared as a unique servant of God, God's final envoy. His death brought a definitive turn in the relationship between God and those who truly serve him. His resurrection was not only a sign of his personal vindication and the beginning of a blessed life in heaven, it underscored that God's rule is about to be fully realized on earth. It meant the end of all oppression, enmity to God, sorrow and death. As one type of early formulas emphasizes: 'Χριστός, the Messiah, died for us (our sins)'.

These essential differences do not make the similarities less important. Further study of the ideas about martyrdom in 2 and 4 Maccabees will prove to be of great importance for a renewed scrutiny of the ideas expressed and implied in early and later passages in Christian writings which try to explain Jesus' death.

30. See J.W. van Henten, *De joodse martelaren*, 221-223 with notes 233-238 on pp. 233-234, on the terminology used in 4 Maccabees.

31. Also 2 Maccabees! This has to be maintained against S.K. Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event* who tries to prove that the concept of vicarious expiatory death can only be documented in 4 Maccabees. We shall have to take into account, of course, that 4 Maccabees is relatively late. But then the terms found in 4 Macc 6,27-29; 17,21-22 need not be used there for the first time. We should emphasize the agreements in thought rather than the differences in terminology between 2 and 4 Maccabees.

32. To mention only one instance of later explanation: in Rom 5,6-11 Paul explains what it means that 'Christ died for us': He died for us when we were yet sinners. He died for the ungodly and that is more than ordinary human beings ever have done — they, at the most, are ready to give their lives for good and righteous people. The effects of Jesus' death are that we are now justified by his blood, and will be saved from the wrath of God; we live as people reconciled to God, in hope of sharing in the glory of God.

33. See also the use of *διαθήκη* in the difficult verse in 2 Macc 7,36 (compare 1,2 and 8,15).

34. See, however, the expression *τῆς τῶν ἀναμαρτήτων νηπίων παρανόμου ἀπωλείας* in 2 Macc 8,4 which, in the context of 2 Maccabees, may refer to the martyrs mentioned in chapter 7 — see J.W. van Henten, *De joodse martelaren*, 13-14.

VIII

JESUS, SON OF DAVID AND SON OF GOD

Research into the beginnings of Christology is one of the most fascinating and, at the same time, one of the most difficult areas of New Testament scholarship. Our dear colleague and friend Bas van Iersel courageously devoted his doctoral dissertation '*Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten*¹ to an effort to go beyond the early Christian confession of Jesus as the Son of God to Jesus' consciousness and claim of a unique relationship to God as his Father. Around the same time he contributed a very interesting paper to the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense 1961, published under the title '*Fils de David et Fils de Dieu*'², dealing with an important aspect of early Christology³. Having devoted myself considerable time and attention in recent years to the problems of early Christology in general⁴ and to the earliest Christian use of *christos* in particular⁵, I have gladly accepted the invitation to contribute to Van Iersel's '*Festschrift*' as an opportunity to enter into a discussion with him. I shall concentrate on the use of the designation 'Son of David' and related expressions in early Christianity and, in particular, on the relationship between Mark 12. 35-37 and Rom 1. 3-4. I shall pay special attention to Van Iersel's '*Fils de David et Fils de Dieu*', some earlier passages in '*Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten*⁶ and also to P.J. Farla's interesting subchapter '*De Davidszoonvraag Mc 12. 35-37*' in his Nijmegen dissertation of 1978 (prepared under Van Iersel's supervision)⁷, in which he develops his master's thesis in a detailed discussion with other interpreters of Mark 12. 35-37⁸.

1 Nijmegen 1961, published as vol. 3 in '*Supplements to Novum Testamentum*', Leiden, 1961 (²1964).

2 In E. Massaux *et. al.*, *La Venue du Messie. Messianisme et Eschatologie* (RechBib 6), Bruges, 1962, 113-132.

3 See also Van Iersel's contribution to the Congress on Paul held in Rome in the same year: '*Saint Paul et la prédication de l'église primitive*', in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus* 1961 (AnBib 17-18), Rome 1963, 433-441.

4 See now my *Christology in Context. The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus*, Philadelphia, 1988.

5 See '*The Earliest Christian Use of Christos. Some Suggestions*', *NTS* 32, 1986, 321-343 (list of earlier publications in note 35 on p. 338), and '*Jezus als profetische Zoon van David*' in F. Garcia Martínez, C.H.J. de Geus en A.F.J. Klijn (eds), *Profeten en Profetische Geschriften* (Fs A.S. van der Woude), Kampen-Nijkerk, 1987, 157-166.

6 Especially 71-73 and 171-175.

7 *Jezus' oordeel over Israël. Een form- en redaktionsgeschichtliche analyse van Mc 10.46-12.40*, Kampen, 1978, especially 272-284.

8 See his remark on p. 272, '*Ordent men de gegevens echter onbevooroordeeld opnieuw, en doet men, wat onbegrijpelijkerwijs nog nauwelijks is gebeurd, recht aan het in de discussie rond Mc 12, 35-37 essentiële gezichtspunt, dat door B.M.F. van Iersel werd ingebracht, dan lijken de problemen zich haast vanzelf op te lossen*'.

The scribes and Jesus on the Messiah as the Son of David in Mark 12. 35-37

In 12. 35-37 the author of the Gospel of Mark presents Jesus' comment on the opinion, attributed to the scribes, that the Messiah is the son of David. He makes Jesus himself raise this matter after a series of disputes and discussions with leading Jews in Jerusalem (see v. 35a, after v. 34b). He questions this opinion by quoting Ps 110.1, and asks: 'David himself calls him Lord; so how is he his son?' This implies criticism, but how far does it reach? Is a positive statement implied, and if so, which?⁹

Van Iersel's comments on Mark 12. 35-37 in his dissertation¹⁰ remain on the cautious side. He deals with this passage in comparison with Matt 22. 41-46. The latter pericope is clearly secondary. Here we find a proper *Streitgespräch* in which Jesus asks explicitly whose son the Messiah is. His Pharisaic opponents say that he is the Son of David, Jesus' answer clearly implies that he is the Son of God. In Mark the designation 'Son of David' is put into question, but not rejected. Jesus is more than Son of David, there is another aspect to be considered¹¹, but this is not specified. The fact that David calls him 'Lord' does not mean that he is 'the Lord'; one might think of 'Son of man' or 'Son of God', but should note that nothing definite is expressed.

In his article 'Fils de David et Fils de Dieu'¹² Van Iersel goes a decisive step further. Jesus' question: 'How can the scribes say that the Messiah is the Son of David' is a rhetorical one, implying a negative answer. But did Jesus then deny that he was a descendant of David? The earliest Christian tradition regards him as such (Rom 1. 3-4; 2 Tim 2.8; Acts 2.30; 13.23; Rev 5.5; 22.16; Matt 1-2; Luke 1-2; 3. 23-38), and this would be unthinkable if Jesus had ever denied it. 'Son of David' must therefore have a pregnant meaning. The term

9 For a survey of recent interpretations see C. Burger, *Jesus als Davidsohn*, FRLANT 98, Göttingen, 1970, 52-59; G. Schneider, 'Die Davidsohnfrage (Mt 12. 35-37)', *Bib* 92, 1972, 65-90; P.J. Farla, *Jezus' oordeel over Israël*, 272-284. See also the bibliography in R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium* 2, HTKNT 2.2, Freiburg-Basel-Wien, 1977, 256-257, at the end of a clear exposition of the pericope on 249-256. Among later treatments should be mentioned B. Chilton, 'Jesus ben David: reflections on the Davidsohnfrage', *JSNT* 14, 1982, 88-112; J.D. Kingsbury, *The Christology of Mark's Gospel*, Philadelphia, 1983, 108-114; D. Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, HNT 3, Tübingen, 1987, 208-209.

10 See *Der Sohn*, 171-173.

11 Here the author refers to D. Daube, who in his 'Four Types of Question' (see his *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, London 1956, 158-169), classifies Jesus' question as a question of *haggadah* trying to solve a conflict between passages of the Bible (here between Ps 110.1 and the current teaching of the scribes respecting the Messiah, based on Scripture). The answer implied is not that one notion is right and the other wrong, but that both are right in different contexts. In his 'Fils de David et Fils de Dieu', 122, n.1 Van Iersel rightly remarks, however, that we do not find two quotations from Scripture here, and that Mark introduces the one opinion explicitly as the opinion of the scribes and not as an interpretation of Scripture. The very fact that the statement is attributed to the scribes, implies that Jesus does not agree (p. 123). Daube's classification of the question, though accepted by many scholars, remains doubtful; we cannot assume without additional arguments that an emphasis on two aspects of the Messiah's being or activity is intended.

12 See, especially, 121-123.

functions here as a messianic title with a very definite content, as in Ps Sol 17.21. The scribes of Jesus' days must have used it as a fixed term for the expected Davidic king who was to restore the kingdom to Israel and expel all foreign oppressors. Van Iersel says: Jesus denies that he is 'Son of David', at least in the sense that the scribes (and his own disciples) see his figure; he does not deny his descent from David.

P.J. Farla agrees with his *Doktorvater*. He discusses at some length the meaning of $\pi\omega\varsigma$ (and $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\nu$) and stresses that its use here implies the rejection of the predicate 'Son of David', which, therefore, stands for the King-Messiah of popular expectation¹³. The question is, I think, whether Jesus rejects the designation as such, or only in as far as it is almost automatically misunderstood by the scribes and their sympathizers. In his recent popular commentary on Mark Van Iersel has remarked that at this point in Mark's story Jesus has rejected neither the designation 'Son of David' (10. 47-48) nor that of 'Messiah' (8.29), but he has not accepted them as suitable designations for himself either.

One thing is clear, according to Van Iersel and Farla: In Mark 12. 35-37 Jesus questions the opinion of the scribes, but does not make a clear statement. Because of the allusive character of the logion this is not likely to have originated in early Christian circles; both authors regard 12. 35b-37a as a genuine word of Jesus¹⁵.

There is room here for some comment. I fully agree with Van Iersel and Farla that the issue at stake is not merely Davidic descent. Once the term 'Messiah' was used for Jesus, it must have been connected with the notion 'Son of David'. The term 'anointed' is not used very often in the Old Testament and in Jewish literature around the beginning of the common era, but it occurs predominantly in connection with David and his descendants. It is also connected with the high priest (and with the ideal high priest of the future). There is no indication, however, that this notion played any role in Christianity of the first century, and the idea of Jesus as the anointed by the Spirit is typical for Luke (Luke 4. 18-19; Acts. 10.38)¹⁶. I doubt, however, whether we may regard Ps Sol 17. 21-25 (the only instance where the term 'Son of David' occurs, and not necessarily as a title) as typical for the nationalistic-political expectations of

13 See *Jezus' oordeel over Israël*, 276 (and n.30 on 493-494), and 280.

14 *Marcus*, Bostel-Brugge, 1986, 200-201.

15 Van Iersel, *Der Sohn*, 171; 'Le Fils de David et le Fils de Dieu', 121 and Farla, *Jezus' oordeel over Israël*, 283-294. The latter adds that Mark 12.36 par. is the only instance in which only the introductory formula 'The Lord said to my Lord' of the much quoted verse Ps 110.1 plays any role in the argumentation. Also in Acts 2. 34-36, however, it is quoted - in order to prove that 'God has made him Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified'. Farla also adduces that Jesus speaks here only very indirectly about himself. This may, however, very well be the intention of the evangelist Mark. He and his readers know that Jesus should be regarded as the Messiah; portraying him as handling the question of Mark 12.35 in an indirect way heightens the tension (so also Van Iersel, *Marcus*, 200-201).

16 See my 'The Earliest Use of *Christos*', especially 329-333 and 335-336, and 'Jezus als profetische Zoon van David', especially 157-161.

the Jewish leaders and the Jewish people, also in Jesus' time. Not only are there many nuances in the picture of the ideal king in Ps Sol 17¹⁷, also in the entire tradition centering around the expectation of a future descendant of David there is room for difference in emphasis.

Mark does not make Jesus reject the term as such, but only as it functions in the expectations of the scribes as he describes them in his gospel. In 9. 9-13 the disciples, after Jesus' announcement that the Son of man would rise from the dead, put the question: 'Why do the scribes say that first Elijah must come?' Jesus affirms that Elijah does come first to restore all things; like the scribes he refers to Scripture (Mal 3. 23-24 [4. 5-6]). He adds, however, another reference to Scripture: 'How is it written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt?' Next, he explains that the expected Elijah has come (in the person of John the Baptist), and that 'they did to him whatever they pleased'; again he adds 'as it is written of him' (cf. 1 Kings 19.2, 10). What the scribes say is not untrue; only one should know whom it concerns, and in what context it should be viewed.

In Mark 15. 31-32 we meet the high priests and the scribes among those who mock Jesus hanging at the cross. They address him as 'the Messiah, the King of Israel', and challenge him to come down from the cross, 'that they may see and believe'. Jesus who refused signs before (8. 11-13) also refuses what would have been a supreme, final sign. The leaders' concept of Messiahship and kingship is wrong, but they rightly address Jesus as Messiah, and he *is* King of Israel, in his own way (15.2)¹⁸.

So Jesus, the Messiah and the King of Israel, is also 'Son of David' in his own way. A little earlier in the story the blind beggar Bartimaeus addresses him as 'Son of David' (10. 46-52). Jesus heals him, declaring that his faith has made him well, and Bartimaeus follows him on the way¹⁹ – the way, in fact, to Jerusalem where Jesus is to die. In the story of the entry Mark tells us that those accompanying Jesus shouted 'Hosanna! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Blessed is the Kingdom of our father David that is coming!' (11. 9-10). Mark makes these people stop short of using the term 'Son of David'; but they call David 'our father' (cf. Acts 2.29; 4.25), they regard Jesus as 'one coming in the name of the Lord' *par excellence*, and their praise of the coming Kingdom of David brings to mind the 14th Benediction of the Shemoneh 'Esreh (Pal. version). 'Be merciful, Lord our God... to the Kingdom of the house of David, thy (righteous) anointed'.

But what then about the use of πῶς in 12.35 and in what way does the quotation of Ps 110.1 qualify the statement that the Messiah is the Son of

17 See especially my Groningen lecture *De Toekomstverwachting in de Psalmen van Salomo*, Leiden, 1965.

18 On Mark 15 see my *Christology in Context*, 61-63. In 15. 31-32 there is also a possible reference to Wis 2.17, 18 (see pp. 62, 178-179).

19 Van Iersel, 'Fils de David et Fils de Dieu', 116-117 rightly remarks that the expression 'your faith has made you well' occurs in a number of different contexts and that its use here does not imply that Jesus accepts the actual designation with which Bartimaeus addresses him.

David? The use of $\pi\omega\varsigma$ is so varied that it is difficult to determine its exact function and meaning in each individual case. It may express displeasure, astonishment and doubt²⁰ and serve as introduction to purely rhetorical questions, but W. Schenk has rightly remarked that it is difficult to distinguish between disapproval, astonishment and the suggestion that something is absolutely impossible²¹. Jesus, in this pericope, clearly puts a large question-mark behind the opinion of the scribes; from Ps 110.1 he deduces that someone whom David calls 'Lord' cannot be 'Son of David' as the scribes envisage him. He does not, however, reject the designation as such, as is clear from the rest of the gospel.

Here, however, Mark indicates no more than that something more should be said. He does not suggest that Jesus should be called 'Lord' (as is the case in Acts 2. 34-36)²². The only time Ps 110.1 recurs is in 14. 61-62, a crucial passage in Mark's Christology, where Jesus gives an affirmative answer to the high priest's question: 'Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed?' and refers to himself as 'the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven'. 'Sitting at the right hand of God' is an essential aspect of the future glory of Jesus, the Messiah – but it is not necessarily connected with the designations 'Son of God' or 'Son of man' used in this passage²³.

For Mark it is important and essential that Jesus, about to be condemned, to suffer and to die, declares in front of the Sanhedrin that he is the Messiah, Son of God who will be seated at God's right hand in accordance with Ps 110.1 and thus will exercise royal power as the Son of David – just as he will execute judgment, as announced in Dan 7.13 in connection with 'one like a son of man'.

Jesus is Son of David, but his activity as king belongs to the future. Are any of his present activities related to this status, too? V. 36 makes clear that David spoke the words of Ps 110.1 'in the Holy Spirit'. This does not refer to

20 So Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1561; cf. W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*, 1988, 1464-1465.

21 In his article in *EWNT* 3, 489-492. P.J. Farla, *Jezus' oordeel over Israël*, 493 n.30 leans too heavily on the article by J.B. Bauer, 'Πῶς in der griechischen Bibel', *NovT* 2, 1958, 81-91. There is a certain tension in Farla's approach. Speaking about Markan redaction he states, on the one hand, that in 10.46-11.11 'Son of David' is the messianic title used when the 'messianic secret' starts being disclosed. On the other hand Mark 12. 35-37 does not play any role in this disclosure; it only demonstrates the rejection of the political messianic expectations of the scribes. It illustrates the great gap between Jesus and the leaders of Israel (see 316).

22 J.D. Kingsbury, *The Christology of Mark's Gospel*, 110-11 rightly emphasizes that in 12.37 κύριος does not function as a christological title, but only serves 'to attribute to the "Messiah" a station and an authority that are superior to the station and authority of "David"'.

23 Kingsbury, who on p. 112 rightly remarks that Mark never directly connects 'Messiah' and 'Son of man', thinks that Mark wants his readers to infer that the counterpart of 'Son of David' in 12. 35-37 is 'Son of God'. 'Son of God' is no doubt the central title in Mark – see below p.104. The designation is implied in 12.6, but we cannot be certain that Mark's readers were supposed to read it between the lines in 12. 35-37.

special, apocalyptic revelation²⁴, but to David's status as inspired psalmist and prophet – a well-known theme in the Old and the New Testament and related literature (see, e.g., 1 Sam 16.13; 2 Sam 23.1, 2; Acts 1.16; 2.30; 4.25). I have dealt with this aspect of David elsewhere²⁵, drawing attention to the tradition about the psalm-singing David as exorcist in 1 Sam 16. 14-23 taken up by Josephus in *Ant* 6. 166-168 and in Ps Philo *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 59, 60; – compare 11Q Ps^a 'David's compositions'. I have suggested there that these traditions concerning David may have led people to interpret Jesus' activity as prophet, teacher, exorcist and healer in terms of the activity of the expected Son of David – Messiah. This would explain why Jesus could be called Messiah already before Easter (as, in all probability, he was)²⁶.

It should be remarked, however, that in Mark the link between Jesus and the prophetic David is only suggested in 12. 35-37, and nowhere fully expressed. Also that in 10. 46-52 Jesus is addressed as Son of David as a healer, and not as an exorcist. It is only in the Gospel of Matthew, which not only underlines Jesus' status as Messiah – Son of David (1.1; 2. 1-2; 21.9, [15]), but also uses the title in a number of healing stories (9. 27-31; 12. 22-23; 15. 21-28; 21. 14-17 besides 20. 29-34 par. Mark 10. 46-52), that an explicit connection is established with his exorcistic ability. After the healing of a blind and dumb demoniac, the people are amazed and say: 'Can this be the Son of David?' (12. 22-23). Likewise, Matthew makes the Syrophoenician woman whose daughter is severely possessed by a demon address Jesus as 'Son of David'²⁷. In view of the proximity between Matt 12. 22-23 and the Q-passage 12. 38-42 where Jesus refers to himself as 'greater than Jonah' and 'greater than Solomon', it has been thought that at least Matthew established a link between Jesus and the great Son of David, Solomon, who in Jewish tradition is not only a wise man, but also one who is able to master demoniac powers²⁸.

In Mark we certainly do not find a clear connection between Jesus and Solomon as exorcist. The connection between Jesus as healer and David has probably to be explained by a general link between Jesus as prophet, teacher,

24 So F. Neugebauer, 'Die Davidssohnfrage (Mark xii, 35-37 parr.) und der Menschensohn', *NTS* 21, 1974-1975, 81-108. On p. 89 he refers to Rev. 1.10; 4.2; 17.3; 21.10, but overlooks that 'in the Spirit' is used there with the verbs 'to be' and 'to carry away'. In n.3 he mentions Ezek 11.24 and 37.1 where, again, the elements of 'vision' and 'being lifted up' are indicated by other terms than the phrase 'in the Spirit'.

25 For further details see my 'The Earliest Use of *Christos*', 334-335 and 'Jezus als profetische Zoon van David', 161-164.

26 On this see also my Shaffer-lectures delivered at Yale Divinity School on 14-16 February 1989 under the title 'Jesus, the Servant-Messiah'.

27 On these texts see Van Iersel, 'Fils de David et Fils de Dieu', 116-118. He rightly remarks that the address 'Son of David' is here connected with ἐλεησόν με (c.q. ἡμῶς). He cannot find any point of contact in the OT or in Jewish tradition and ascribes this to liturgical use in the primitive church (see also p. 130). Test Sol 20.1 is not a useful parallel, in view of the complicated textual history of that writing (contra K. Berger, 'Die königlichen Messias-traditionen des Neuen Testaments', *NTS* 20, 1973-1974, 1-44, esp. 3-9).

28 On this see also 'Jezus als profetische Zoon van David', 165-166, and 'The Earliest Use of *Christos*', 334-335.

exorcist and healer and David as prophet and exorcist, the essential point being that God's Holy Spirit inspired and empowered both²⁹. Bruce Chilton, who has recently devoted much attention to the possible Solomonic background of the 'Son of David' passages in Matthew and Mark, moves too easily from exorcism in particular to healing in general. His final thesis that in the Synoptic tradition (and in Mark 12. 35-37 in particular) Jesus 'presupposes his identification as David's Son, and denies that this is a messianic claim' cannot be substantiated³⁰. The issue in our pericope is not whether the healing 'Son of David' is the Messiah, but whether the Messiah is the 'Son of David'.

Jesus as descendant of David and Son of God in Rom 1. 3-4

In his '*Der Sohn*' in den synoptischen Jesusworten Van Iersel deals with the ancient formula used by Paul in Rom 1. 3-4 in the context of his efforts to determine the earliest Christian kerygma concerning Jesus as the Son of God which is also found in the discourses in Acts 1-13³¹. The precise wording and meaning of the ancient formula have been subject of much discussion³²; Van Iersel opts for τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ, τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν as original text, and emphasizes as characteristics of all kerygmatic formulas: the statement that Jesus is the Son of God, the reference (explicit or implicit) to testimonies in the OT (notably 2 Sam 7.14 and Ps 2.7), the connection between sonship and resurrection and the clear titular use of 'Son of God'. They differ from earlier authentic statements of Jesus himself, preserved in the Synoptics (Mark 13.32 par. Matt 24.36; Mark 12. 1-9 par. Matt 21. 33-41; Luke 20. 9-16 and Matt 11.27 par. Luke 10.22) in which Jesus expresses his unique relationship as Son with God, the Father.

In 'Fils de David et Fils de Dieu'³³ Rom 1.3-4 is discussed in the context of Van Iersel's thesis that 'Son of David' was later completely avoided because of its Jewish messianic connotations, though Jesus' descent from David remained important. As Van Iersel puts it: In the preaching of the primitive

29 See also Isa 11. 1-5 which influenced Ps Sol 17. 23-24, 35-37; 18. 6-7; IQSb 5. 20-29; 4Q 161, 8-10 (cf. 1En 49).

30 See his '*Jesus ben David: reflections on the Davidsohnfrage*' mentioned in n.9; the quotation is from p. 101. Chilton notes, of course, an 'apparent anomaly' with Mk 14.61 where Jesus confesses to 'the famous charge' of the high priest(s), and tries to explain it on pp. 101-105. I do not quite understand his argument on these pages leading to the conclusion: 'In the end, however, the conviction that he did claim to be God's Messiah, no matter what he said about his being David's Son, prevailed, and Jesus himself could not deny the suspicion' (p. 105).

31 See 71-73 and 173-175.

32 Among many recent studies I mention only two that give a clear survey of the various options of interpretation: C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* I, ICC, Edinburgh, 1975, 57-65 and P.-E. Langevin S.J., 'Une confession paulinienne de la "Seigneurie" du Christ' in R. Laflamme and M. Gervais (eds), *Le Christ, hier, aujourd'hui et demain*, Québec, 1976, 277-327.

33 See especially 115, 123-127 and 130 n.2 (where the author discusses, at some length, the Pauline additions in Rom 1. 3-4: κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα ἐγλώσσης).

church the designation υἱὸς Δαυὶδ is reduced to ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ (and similar expressions). The fact that certain promises to David were fulfilled is important, but far more important is the way in which they became true: Jesus proved to be the Son of God (Luke 1. 26-34; Acts 13.23, 32-41; Rom 1. 3-4; Ignatius, Eph 20.2; Smyrn 1.1).

Again, I think, there is room for a different assessment of the evidence. Does the difference in terminology really suggest difference in meaning? In 2 Sam 7.12; 1 Chron 17.13 the LXX uses the expression τὸ σπέρμα σου ... ὃς ἔσται ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας σου (cf Ps 89 [LXX 88].4 (cf. v. 37) τὸ σπέρμα σου)³⁴. In Jer 23.5; 33.15 we find the term 'righteous Branch' (for David) (see also Zech 3.8; 6.12; 4Qpatr 3-4; 4Qflor I.11; 4Q 161. 8-10 line 11). Beside Ps Sol 17.21, 'raise up unto them their king, the (or: a) son of David' there is v. 4, 'You, o Lord, chose David King over Israel, and you swore to him concerning his seed for ever, that his kingship would never fail before you.'

Next, when early Christians, convinced that Jesus was the anointed one, read the texts in the Scriptures about the promises to David concerning his offspring, the question immediately arose in what sense the words concerning David's descendant as Son of God (2 Sam 7.14; 1 Chron 17.13 [cf. 22.10; 28.6]; Ps 2.7; 89. 27-28; cf. 4Qflor I. 10-13 [and 18-19]) had to be interpreted; and how the words about his rule 'for ever' and his complete victory over the enemies were meant (2 Sam 7. 12-13, 16; 1 Chron 17. 11-12, 14; Ps 89. 4-5, 20-38). Rom 1. 3-4 answers that the one 'who was descended from David according to the flesh' was 'designated (by God) Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead'.

A great number of problems arise, but cannot be solved here. I would suggest that the words 'in power' belong to the ancient formula referred to by Paul. Its second clause deals with the reign of Jesus, descendant of David, as powerful Son of God (cf. e.g. Mark 9.1). This 'power' has become evident since, and in the fact of, his resurrection from the dead, sign of God's intervention on Jesus' behalf, and of the beginning of a dynamic new era. There can be no doubt that ὁρισθέντος means 'designated, appointed' (Acts 10.42; 17.31) and not simply 'declared', but if already the original formula referred to the 'Son of God in power', it cannot have meant that the one who was David's descendant during his life on earth only became Son of God when he was raised from the dead³⁵.

Attention has often been drawn to Acts 2.36 and 13.33, thought to repre-

34 See also Ps 132 (LXX 131).11 ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς κοιλίας σου and 2 Chron 6.9 ὁ υἱὸς σου, ὃς ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τῆς ὁσφύος σου. Van Iersel's remark, that ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ is a purposely weaker expression than τὸ σπέρμα Δαυὶδ seems to be far-fetched.

35 See e.g. H. Merkley, 'Die Auferweckung Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie (Messias bzw. Sohn Gottes und Menschensohn)', ZNW 72, 1981, 1-26 (now in his *Studien zu Jesus und Paulus*, WUNT 43, 221-246), esp. 13-16 (233-236). Bruce Chilton, 'Jesus ben David...', 97 rightly reminds us that in Rev 3.7; 5.5; 22.16 'the heavenly triumph of Jesus comes to expression precisely with reference to David.'

sent an early stage in Christology preserved by the author of Acts³⁶ in order to prove that at least at some stage some Christians connected the beginning of Jesus' divine sonship with his resurrection. But certainly the author of Acts did not think so (see Luke 1. 32, 35; Acts 9. 20, 22) and yet he included these statements among those he regarded as not only representative of the oldest preaching but also as binding for his readers. And if it is argued that Paul added the words 'in power' in order to bring the ancient formula in line with his conviction that Jesus was Son of God from the beginning (see v. 3, 'the gospel concerning his Son, who...'), one may point to the fact that already in the tradition before Paul the designation 'Son of God' was not only connected with the texts concerning David, but also with an ancient pattern of thought according to which God sent his Son on a unique mission (Rom 8. 3-4; Gal. 4.4; Mark 12. 1-9; John 3.16, 17; 1 John 4.6). It should be added that also the notion of the exemplary righteous one as Son of God (Wis 2. 12-20; 5. 1-7) may have influenced early Christian thinking about Jesus as Son of God *par excellence* (Mark 15. 29-32, 34)³⁷. If from the earliest stages onward the term 'Son of God' could carry several connotations, the problem of combining the various aspects of Jesus' divine sonship must have arisen very soon, and not just when Paul incorporated an ancient formula in the introduction of his letter to the important church of Rome.

We should, therefore, not speak of a *Zweistufenchristologie* in Rom. 1. 3-4³⁸. This formula deals with two aspects rather than with two stages. Jesus Christ is Son of David and Son of God all along; his being 'Son of God in power' manifests itself at his resurrection from the dead. With regard to the opposition 'according to the flesh' and 'according to the Spirit of holiness' (whether Pauline or not) it should be remarked that κατὰ σάρκα as such need not have a pejorative meaning; the nearest parallels are Rom 4.1 and 9.3, 5, where human ancestry and human kinship are envisaged. Κατὰ πνεῦμα³⁹ indicates a special initiative on the part of God (Gal 4.23, 28-29; Rom. 9.8). These two phrases in this context put a special emphasis on the two aspects of Jesus' position as descendant of David and Son of God.

Mark 12. 35-37 and Rom 1. 3-4

The two passages with which this essay is concerned deal with the same problem. If Jesus may be called the Christ, the anointed one, the predictions

36 See also B. van Iersel, *Der Sohn in den synoptischen Jesusworten*, 31-77 and 'Saint Paul et la prédication de l'église primitive'. Van Iersel (p. 73) has rightly pointed out that especially 2 Sam 7. 12-14 with its ἀναστήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου... may have led early Christians to connect Jesus' divine sonship with his resurrection; yet they could hardly derive from this text that he become only Son of God after being raised from the dead by God. Acts 2.36 goes back to Ps 110.1 and 13.33 quotes Ps 2.7.

37 On this, see my *Christology in Context*, 167-169.

38 The expression was first coined by E. Schweizer, see e.g. *TWNT* 8, 368, cf. F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*, FRLANT 83, Göttingen, 1963, 252 (quoting an earlier article of E. Schweizer from 1957).

39 Κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιασμένης (perhaps better rendered as 'spirit of sanctification') is not the typical Pauline opposition to κατὰ σάρκα. Cf. also 1 Pet 3.18; 1 Tim 3.16.

in 2 Sam 7, Ps 2 and Ps 89 must refer to him. Rom 1. 3-4 combines Jesus' descent from David and his rule in power as Son of God. Mark 12. 35-37 implicitly calls him Messiah and Son of David, quotes Ps 110.1 in order to indicate his future glorification, but stops short of using any further designation, including 'Son of God'. Jesus is addressed as 'Son of David' in 10. 46-52 (and, obliquely, in 11.10). The reader knows, of course, that for Mark Jesus is the Son of God. He has told his readers that God himself has declared as much, first to Jesus himself (1.11) and later to three disciples (9.7); the demons have divulged Jesus' secret (3.11; 5.7) and he has himself hinted at his special relationship with God (12.6). After the pericope in question 13.32; 14. 61-62; 15.39 are still to follow⁴⁰. In 8.38-9.1; 14. 61-62 (cf. 13. 24-27) we hear about the future glory and dominion of the vindicated Jesus (cf. 11.10), but there is no exclusive relation here with his being Son of God. Mark answers the problem, posed by the important passages concerning David and his offspring, in a way that is very similar to, but not identical with the solution expressed in the pre-Pauline formula in Rom 1. 3-4; understandably, he uses his entire gospel to tell his story and to make clear who Jesus really is in the light of the announcements in Scripture. In his story Mark 12. 35-37 is merely an episode, allusive rather than descriptive, preparing for more explicit statements yet to follow (e.g. in 14. 61-62). The allusive nature of this short utterance of Jesus fits into Mark's overall scheme; we are not allowed to use it as proof for the authenticity of the saying⁴¹.

⁴⁰ It remains disputed whether 'the Son of God' in Mark 1.1 belongs to the original text.

⁴¹ See also Van Iersel's own remarks on pp. 220-201 of his *Marcus*, referred to in note 15 above.

PART II

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

IX

THE MAIN ISSUES IN THE STUDY OF THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS*

On the 10th of July 1978 it was 25 years since I had defended my thesis before the Faculty of Theology of the University of Leiden.¹ On the 2nd of October of that year the new edition of the Greek text of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, prepared over a number of years by a small group of people in the same faculty of the same university, came off the press.² One will understand that the attainment of this milestone gave rise to introspection, retrospection and circumspection. What have I achieved in all those years, what should still be done, why is there still so much difference of opinion among scholars working in the field of the Testaments? Why do I keep returning to them and why do I have the feeling that the more I know the more complications I notice?

In this pensive mood I agreed to write an article for part II, vol. 20 of *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*³ entitled: 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: central problems and essential viewpoints'. It was completed and sent to the editors last April. I now use the opportunity presented by the fact that the Secretary of our Society, because of Professor Barrett's very unfortunate accident, needed a substitute lecturer at short notice, to report to you in a more personal manner on the results of my introspection, laid down in the article just mentioned. I am looking forward to a lively discussion, and I hope that my wording will be provocative enough to start it. The main issues in the study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are not altogether unrelated to those in the study of the Old and New Testaments.

One final introductory remark: I am standing here as a member of the Pseudepigrapha Seminar, set up by the Society a few years ago. At the

* Paper read at the 34th Meeting of the S.N.T.S., Durham, England, August 1979. For a more detailed documentation and argumentation the reader is referred to the *A.N.R.W.* article mentioned in the introduction.

¹ *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin* (Assen, 1953; 2nd 1975).

² *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*, by M. de Jonge in cooperation with H. W. Hollander, H. J. de Jonge and Th. Korteweg (= *Ps.V.T.Gr.* I,2) (Leiden, 1978). See also the 'editio minima' *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum*, edited according to Cambridge University Library MS Ff 1.24 fols. 203a-261b (= *Ps.V.T.Gr.* I) (Leiden, 1964; rev. ed. 1970), and *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation*, ed. M. de Jonge (*St.V.T.Ps.* 3) (Leiden, 1975).

³ Edited by Wolfgang Haase and published by W. de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.

S.N.T.S. meeting held at Duke University, Durham N.C. in August 1976, the debates centred on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.⁴ In that same meeting Robert A. Kraft read a remarkable paper, unfortunately still unpublished, on 'The Christianity of the Pseudepigrapha'. What I shall be saying today is, in some ways, a contribution to a continued discussion of the problems raised in the Duke seminar and Dr Kraft's lecture.

I. THE TEXT

1. *Witnesses to the text*

At this moment fifteen Greek MSS are known, containing either a continuous Greek text or only excerpts. None of them is older than the tenth century. Of the ancient versions only the Armenian translation is of real importance. A satisfactory edition does not yet exist; in view of the fact that it is hardly possible or necessary to use all the 50-odd MSS known today, M. E. Stone has undertaken to publish an *editio minor* on the basis of eight MSS, the best representatives of four different types of text. Appendix II B in the new Leiden edition of the Greek text, compiled with the help of Dr Stone and on the basis of material provided by him, gives 'Variant Readings in Armenian found in the Testaments of Levi, Issachar, Zebulun (VI-X) and Joseph' in a literal English translation. These will help readers to form some idea of the value of A in textual criticism. One thing is clear: this value has been greatly overrated; only in seven cases, where its evidence proved important for the constitution of the text, is the Armenian version mentioned in the apparatus of the new edition. And as to the claim that the Armenian version (which has a shorter text in many passages) goes back to a Greek original which had suffered less from Christian interpolations than the existing Greek MSS, Dr Stone has shown convincingly 'that Armenian seems to start off the translation of certain Testaments following the Greek closely, but then, part of the way through, a process of abbreviation, particularly in parenthetic sections, commences'.⁵ This means that any attempt to reconstruct a shorter, less Christian text of the Testaments with the help of A is bound to lead to unsatisfactory results.

2. *Reconstruction of the text*

The reconstruction of the oldest attainable text proved to be difficult. Henk-Jan de Jonge's attempt to reconstruct a *stemma codicum* (published in an important article in 1972)⁶ was scrutinized very carefully while the new

⁴ See J. H. Charlesworth, 'Reflections on the SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminar at Duke on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', *N.T.S.* xxiii (1976-77), 296-304.

⁵ 'New Evidence for the Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', *R.B.* lxxxiv (1977), 94-107, especially p. 104.

⁶ 'Die Textüberlieferung der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen', *Z.N.W.* lxiii (1972), 27-44, reprinted in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (n. 2), ch. II.

edition was being prepared and thousands of individual variants had to be weighed. In the *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, edited by the present speaker in 1975, one finds the outcome of a continuing debate, laid down in several articles,⁷ leading up to a new article by Henk-Jan de Jonge: 'The earliest traceable stage of the textual tradition of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs'⁸ with a revised and completed *stemma*. One should note the following main points.

(i) There are two families, the first consisting of MSS *b* and *k*, and the second of all the remaining witnesses.

(ii) Within family II two sub-families can be distinguished. One consists of *g l d m* plus *Fm*^d, another of Serb *n c h i j* Ngr. Both sub-families are complex; moreover, there is secondary influence from the second sub-family on *d m*, and *l* has many readings in common with *b*.

(iii) Sub-family *g l d m Fm*^d seems to be nearest to the archetype of family II; next follows *A*, then *e*, *S*, *af*, while the sub-family Serb *n c h i j* Ngr seems to be furthest removed.

(iv) All this represents a great difference from the *stemma* reconstructed by R. H. Charles,⁹ consisting of two families: $\alpha = chi$ and $\beta = aef S + bdg A$. Of these Charles preferred, in general, family α .

The archetype of the present textual witnesses has to be reconstructed on the basis of the reconstruction of the hyparchetypes of families I and II. In practice this proved not easy, because of the scarcity of witnesses in family I (*k* gives only extracts) and because of the complex relations within family II. Comparison of the two reconstructed hyparchetypes did not always lead to a definite choice for the reading of one of the two families. In a comparatively large number of cases the reading of family I was printed in the text for no other reason than that the one of family II was not clearly better. In Appendix I of the edition all variants between the two hyparchetypes were listed with a clear indication of the editors' preference or non-preference.

The uncertainties connected with the reconstruction of a *stemma codicum* do not provide us with an excuse to give up attempts at reconstruction altogether and to resort to an unbridled eclecticism. I should like to repeat here what I remarked in the introduction to the edition (p. xxxix): 'Theories on relationships represented in a *stemma* should never lead to mechanical application of certain rules. Yet a consistent search for strict evidence, pointing to or excluding genealogical relationships (conjunctive and disjunctive errors), and the observation of regular patterns in the sharing of clearly secondary readings, is an indispensable help.' It prevents us – I may

⁷ Particularly chapters VIII, 'The Greek Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Armenian Version' and X, 'Textual criticism and the analysis of the composition of the Testament of Zebulun' by M. de Jonge and chapter XI, 'Further observations on the transmission of the text' by Th. Korteweg.

⁸ *Studies*, chapter III.

⁹ *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford, 1908), xxii.

add – from selecting those readings which agree with our theories concerning the development of the text and the historical circumstances reflected in that development. Literary criticism and historical research should start only after the textual data have been studied with a view to the reconstruction of the oldest attainable text.

3. *The date of the oldest attainable text*

The oldest Greek witness for the text is MS *b*, dating from the tenth century. Henk-Jan de Jonge rightly remarked that this means ‘that the whole surviving MS-tradition, without exception, may derive from one ninth- or tenth-century minuscule codex’.¹⁰ There is only one way to prove that the archetype which one tries to reconstruct was older, and that is by showing that the Testaments were transliterated not once but twice from majuscule to minuscule script. Henk-Jan de Jonge has, indeed, made an attempt to prove this: he has given thirteen instances where divergencies between family I and family II can be traced to different interpretations of uncial characters, and his conclusion is, therefore, that there is reason to suppose that the reconstructed text is earlier than the ninth century.¹¹

Unfortunately there are only very few clear references to the Testaments in early Christian literature, the oldest and most important being a reference to T. Reub II and III in Origen’s homilies on Joshua 15. 6. This and a comparable reference to T. Napht II 8 in Jerome’s *Tractatus de Psalmo XV* do not enable us to draw any conclusions with regard to the text Jerome and Origen had before them.¹² If on the basis of the reference in Origen we accept the beginning of the third century A.D. as the *terminus ad quem* of the Testaments, we must reckon with the possibility that a lot may have happened between A.D. 200 and the unknown moment when the archetype of the present textual tradition originated.

Recently, C. Burchard and M. E. Stone have argued, on linguistic and stylistic grounds, that the Armenian translation (the oldest known MSS of which date from the thirteenth century) is ancient, perhaps of the seventh or sixth century. It has, however, a shorter text in T. Zebulun which is also found in all other family II witnesses, except *gldm*. Elsewhere I have tried to show that it is the result of a deliberate recensional activity;¹³ in this case the longer text in *gldm* represents the hyparchetype of family II, and because of the agreement with *b* also the archetype of the entire MS-tradition. This means that A cannot be older than the ninth or tenth century; the oldest Greek witness for the short text, MS *e*, in fact dates from the eleventh century. To clarify the matter a search ought to be made for traces of the Armenian

¹⁰ ‘The earliest traceable stage. . .’, *Studies*, chapter III, p. 66.

¹¹ See his entire article, particularly the conclusions on p. 79.

¹² For details see the new edition, pp. xxx–xxxii.

¹³ See *Studies*, chapter x (cf. n. 7), and chapter VIII, also for the opinions of Burchard and Stone.

version stemming from the period before the ninth century. Only if these can be found would it be possible to bring the Armenian version, and the Greek text from which it was translated, back to the seventh or sixth century.

At present, it remains hazardous to use arguments from the textual history known to us for the reconstruction of the transmission of the text in the period between the beginning of the third century and the origin of the archetype of the present textual tradition. It is all the more dubious to use text-critical arguments to trace the history of the text before A.D. 200, particularly when it is done in the hope of reconstructing an older Jewish document. In my opinion, the case for an originally Jewish writing must be argued on the basis of arguments other than text-critical ones.

I have dwelt rather a long time on these textual matters. For one thing, the witnesses I mentioned provide the primary material with which one has to work and from which all subsequent research has to start. Secondly, (too) few students of the Testaments have realized that even the best edition of the Testaments can only provide a Byzantine text, and that only with great caution may we work our way back to the text Origen knew, and to other forms of text which are possibly even earlier. The situation is entirely different from that in the case of the Christian writings collected in the New Testament, where the textual evidence is almost too abundant, and the earliest witnesses are much nearer in time to the origin of the documents.

II. RELATED HEBREW AND ARAMAIC MATERIAL

I. *Fragments of a Levi-text*

In Appendix III of Charles's edition of the Greek text of the Testaments published in 1908¹⁴ we find substantial fragments of a text dealing with Levi, found among the Cairo Genizah material kept in the University libraries of Cambridge and Oxford, plus a small Syriac fragment running parallel to a portion of the Aramaic text. Particularly significant was Charles's discovery that the second major addition in the Greek MS *ε* (inserted after T. Levi xviii 2, and interrupting the text of that chapter) runs parallel to parts of the Aramaic text and has a long extra passage, showing that the equivalent of some four columns (one leaf) is apparently lost in the Aramaic.

The discoveries at Qumran have yielded a number of new fragments, detected and deciphered with great industry and ingenuity by J. T. Milik. Most important was his publication of part of one leaf of an Aramaic Levi-text which partly overlaps the text of a 'Prayer of Levi' found in MS *ε* as an insertion (again without any connection with the text) at T. Levi ii 3.¹⁵ Various other, much smaller fragments have been announced or discussed by

¹⁴ See n. 9.

¹⁵ 'Le Testament de Lévi en Araméen. Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrân', *R.B. LXII* (1955), 398-406.

Milik in a number of publications.¹⁶ If we survey the contents of the Aramaic Levi-material on the basis of the existing fragments from the Cairo Genizah, and the Qumran Caves, plus the translated passages in *e*, we find that all these fragments must ultimately go back to one document and that this document must have contained parallels to most of the present Greek Testament of Levi. The priestly material corresponding to T. Levi ix is greatly expanded; we find nothing comparable to the very small introductory chapter i and to chapter x, and only very little corresponding to the text of the Testament after chapter xiii. Where the scribe of MS *e* acquired the text of his extensive additions we do not know. Neither do we know whether he had more material at his disposal which he did not copy. The addition at T. Levi 113 forms a unity and is inserted at the place it must have occupied in the alternative Greek Levi-text it is taken from. This may indicate that *e*'s scribe still knew the context to which the inserted fragment belonged, and consequently tried to find a place for it.

2. *Non-Levi material*

Since 1956 we know of the existence of a Hebrew fragment containing Bilhah's genealogy in a much larger form than the one found in T. Naphtali 16-12. Whether it really belonged to a Naphtali-text and whether this was a Testament of Naphtali we do not know. Milik, in his latest discussion of the topic, calls it 4 QH(ébreu) Naphtali.¹⁷ There is no connection with the medieval Hebrew Testament of Naphtali given as Appendix 11 in Charles's edition of the Testaments. Very recently Milik has discussed a number of very small fragments which he wants to assign to Aramaic Testaments of Judah and Joseph,¹⁸ but as far as I can judge the existence of such documents cannot be proved or even made plausible on the basis of these very small and extremely mutilated fragments.

I pass over the parallels which exist between the accounts of the wars of the sons of Jacob against the Amorites and against Esau and his sons, given in T. Judah III-vii and ix and Jubilees as well as in the late Midrash Wayyissa'u.¹⁹ I point only very briefly to Th. Korteweg's recent study of the Testament of Naphtali,²⁰ where he compares the visions in the present Greek Testament with parallel material in the Hebrew Testament and stresses that details in the Greek version can only be understood against the background of the fuller and more consistent account in Hebrew. Both the Greek and the Hebrew testaments must go back to a common tradition, in some cases more

¹⁶ The latest of which is his 'Ecrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d'Hénoch à Amram' in M. Delcor *et al.*, *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (B.E.Th.L. 46) (Paris-Gembloux/Leuven, 1978), 91-106.

¹⁷ See his 'Ecrits préesséniens', 97.

¹⁸ 'Ecrits préesséniens', 97-102.

¹⁹ Text in Charles's edition (n. 9), Appendix 1.

²⁰ 'The meaning of Naphtali's visions', chapter xvi in *Studies in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

adequately preserved in the late Hebrew text than in the Greek testament incorporated in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. I now turn to the important question of the genre, date and provenance of the material mentioned in §1 and the first part of §2.

3. *Genre, date and provenance of the nearest related material*

Whether the Aramaic Levi-document represented by the Genizah- and Qumran-fragments may be called a Testament has been a matter of much debate. I prefer to speak about 'Aramaic Levi' and note that J. T. Milik calls the document 'the Testament (or the Visions) of Levi',²¹ rightly connecting it with the fragments of 'Amram- and Qahat-documents published by himself in 1972.²² In my 'Notes on the Testament of Levi II-VII', first published in 1974,²³ I wrote: 'It may not be too rash to suppose that the Levi-, Qahat- and 'Amram-material belongs to a series of documents giving priestly final exhortations and visions, preserved in the sectarian priestly circles whose literature was hidden at Qumran'. On the basis of what I have first remarked in §2 I would like to add: There is no other material that points to the existence of individual testaments of sons of Jacob in Qumran – only the medieval testament of Naphtali is clearly called *צוֹמַח נַפְתָּלִי*. We must seriously consider the possibility that the plan to write a document called *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* was conceived by a later author or group of authors, probably writing Greek.

Milik classifies the Aramaic material connected with Levi and (according to him) with other sons of Jacob, together with a number of other fragments, among the 'écrits préesséniens de Qumrân'. He dates them in the third century B.C. if not towards the end of the fourth, and connects them with Samaria.²⁴ Hultgård,²⁵ however, remains unconvinced and is of the opinion that we should keep on the safe side. Ar. Levi may be pre-essenian, but in that case its origin is to be sought in the priestly milieu of the Temple of Jerusalem at the beginning of the second century B.C. before the Maccabean struggle.

For the purpose of the present survey the question of the provenance of the Hebrew and Aramaic material need not receive a definite answer. It is sufficient to know that at least the Aramaic Levi-document was known to and used by the Qumran sect, together with related material that helps to shed light on the traditions incorporated in the Testaments. This fact makes it plausible that also other similar material which helps us to explain those traditions but which happens to have been preserved in later Hebrew or

²¹ 'Ecrits préesséniens', 95.

²² '4Q visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène', *R.B.* LXXIX (1972), 77–97.

²³ In *Travels in the World of the Old Testament. Studies presented to Professor M. A. Beek* (Assen, 1974), 132–45. Now chapter xv in *Studies*; the quotation is found there on p. 258.

²⁴ See his 'Ecrits préesséniens', *passim*.

²⁵ *L'Eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches. I. Interprétation des textes* (*Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Hist. Relig.* 6) (Uppsala, 1977), 26–31.

Aramaic documents may go back to the time around the beginning of the common era.

The next question is whether we can determine the relation between the Greek Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and this material more precisely.

4. *The present Greek Testaments and the parallel material*

If we concentrate for a moment on the Ar. Levi-document and the Greek Testament of Levi we note that there are so many differences between the two writings that it would be unwise to suppose a direct literary dependence of the Greek Testament on the Aramaic document or a direct ancestor of it. For one thing, thanks to the scribe of *e* we know that this Levi-document (or at least extensive portions of it) existed at one time in Greek. The Greek text of *e* keeps very close to the Aramaic but there may have been (an)other form(s) of text further removed from the Aramaic-Greek fragments as we know them, and the author of the present Greek Testament may have used the material in such a form.

This is, admittedly, somewhat speculative, but I mention this possibility to warn against two simplifications. In my dissertation²⁶ I presented the author of the Testaments as the collector and redactor of written material and assumed too readily that this material was known to him in the form suggested by the extant Levi-documents.

The second simplification has been very popular since the Qumran fragments were discovered and other Qumran parallels to the Testaments were found. Even if one did not regard the Testaments as Qumranic, one supposed direct literary and historical connections. The material preserved at Qumran was thought to have influenced other groups within second- and first-century Judaism, in which it underwent parallel and different developments to those found in the Qumran sect. The latest example of this approach is found in A. Hultgård's *L'Eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*,²⁷ which, with great ingenuity, tries to sketch a development of ideas in various Jewish circles from the beginning of the second century B.C. to the beginning of the first century A.D. on the basis of Ar. Levi and the different stages of redaction which, in Hultgård's opinion, are still visible in the present Testaments.

Inevitably much will remain unknown about the ways the materials incorporated into the present Testaments reached the author(s) of that writing. I should like to stress the great variety in the material. It is likely that the present Testament of Levi was modelled upon a Levi-document of some sort. The Judah-traditions and the Naphtali material, briefly mentioned above, are quite different. In the case of T. Joseph III-IX M. Braun tried to show some forty years ago that the author makes use of Judaized elements

²⁶ See note 1. T. Levi is discussed there on pp. 38-52.

²⁷ See note 25.

known from Hellenistic romances, especially material of the Phaedra-tradition.²⁸ A full survey of this material would reveal a great diversity. This diversity militates against direct literary dependence presupposing historical continuity.

It is possible and even probable that the author(s), whoever he (they) may have been, was collector of all sorts of material connected with the sons of Jacob. This material may have reached him (them) in a variety of ways and may have been known to him (them) in different forms. The central question is, how he (they) used it and to what purpose. To this question we now turn.

Before we do this, it may not be superfluous to state clearly that it cannot be proved that the Testaments in their present form (or nearly their present form) were, at one time, translated from Aramaic into Greek. In fact, it is practically certain that the present Testaments were composed in Greek: in many instances the Testaments use or presuppose the wording of the LXX,²⁹ and, in the parenetic passages of the Testaments in particular, Hellenistic and Hellenistic-Jewish terms play an important part.³⁰

III. THE TESTAMENTS AS A COLLECTION OF FAREWELL DISCOURSES

1. *Some remarks on method*

In the past years scholarship has made considerable progress in identifying and collecting parallel and related material. Attention ought now to be concentrated on redaction-criticism, or rather (because analysis of the editorial process presupposes a detailed delineation of sources and fixed traditions) composition-criticism. The central issue is: how did the author/editor mould together those things he took over from others and his own personal contribution in a consistent whole, serving a particular purpose?

Here a few words on literary criticism and form-criticism are in order. In the past many literary critics of the Testaments have tried to reconstruct the history of this writing by distinguishing between sources, contributions of the author and later interpolations and additions, or (if the latter were thought to be numerous and far-reaching) by distinguishing different stages in the making of the document.³¹ Their criteria have been those of other literary critics: unevennesses, doublets, sudden transitions as to form and content, all other signs of inconsistency. It is not at all evident, however, that modern critics, applying modern standards of consistency, are in a position to determine whether there are inconsistencies or not. And if inconsistencies

²⁸ In his *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature* (Oxford, 1938), 44-95.

²⁹ See my dissertation, pp. 117-18 and p. 163, n. 5.

³⁰ See H. C. Kee, 'The Ethical Dimension of the Testaments of the XII as a Clue to Provenance', *N.T.S.* xxiv (1977-78), 259-71.

³¹ For this and other aspects of scholarly research on the Testaments see H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A critical history of research* (*S.B.L. Mon. Ser.* 21) (Missoula, 1977); but see my review in *J.S.J.* ix (1978), 108-11.

exist, they are hardly more understandable if ascribed to the activities of a redactor or interpolator than if the so-called original author is held responsible for them.

Form-criticism is important for the analysis of the introductions and closing passages of the individual testaments. In my dissertation I described two 'patterns' found in the parts of the testaments dealing with the future; I called them Sin-Exile-Return passages and Levi-Judah passages.³² In 1955 P. H. Aschermann described various forms of parenesis in the Testaments³³ and lately Harm W. Hollander, analysing the first half of T. Joseph, has found influence of various forms found in the Book of Psalms.³⁴ I should like to emphasize, however, that to undertake a comparative analysis of 'forms' in order to find fixed patterns of thought and expression, as well as literary 'genres' and conventions, is one thing; to determine how these 'forms' are used within a certain document is quite another matter. Understandably, form-critics are always looking for constant elements, phenomena which occur again and again in all sorts of documents of different times and places, and they try to discover the original, 'pure', forms and the *Sitz im Leben* for them. 'Forms', however, tend to lead their own lives, and may be taken over for different purposes and in different situations, and they may be varied in many ways.

In the case of the Testaments it is important to pay every attention to the ways in which these forms were made to serve the purpose of the author(s) of this particular writing. We may not assume, for instance, that purer or more complete forms were extant at an earlier stage of the Testaments, but were spoiled by additions or other editorial activities of later redactors. Particularly if the author(s) of the Testaments has (have) brought together as much traditional material concerning the Sons of Jacob as he (they) could find, in order to use it for his (their) particular purpose, we must allow for the possibility that form-criticism, like literary criticism, can serve only a limited purpose. Literary seams (of all sorts) may be signs of compilation as much as of anything else. At the moment an author (authors) decided to put together admonitions, exemplary stories about the sons of Jacob and predictions concerning the future within the framework of a collection of twelve testaments, this process of compilation necessarily implied the use of material that varied in form and content. However neatly it was put together, some sutures were bound to remain. We should note, but not over-emphasize them.

The implications of these remarks on method should now be illustrated by a number of examples. Let me concentrate on three topics.

³² See pp. 83-9.

³³ 'Die parännetischen Formen der "Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen" und ihr Nachwirken in der frühchristlichen Mahnung. Eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung,' Diss. Masch. Berlin, 1955.

³⁴ In his article 'The Ethical Character of the Patriarch Joseph', in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr (ed.), *Studies on the Testament of Joseph (S.B.L. Septuagint and cognate Studies 5)* (Missoula, 1975), 47-104, esp. pp. 47-60.

2. General features of the individual testaments

The opening and closing passages are clearly influenced by Gen. 49. 1-2, 29-33 and Gen. 50. 24-6, and they incorporate traditional elements known from other sources. Scholars have looked for parallels to the literary 'genre' represented by the Testaments. Klaus Baltzer treated the Testaments in connection with his analysis of 'das Bundesformular'.³⁵ Anitra Bingham Kolenkow has shown that we should, at least, distinguish between 'blessing-revelation testaments' and 'ethical testaments' – our Testaments belong to the second category.³⁶ Enrico Cortès deals with them in the wider context of 'farewell discourses' which is, perhaps, the wisest thing to do.³⁷

After the patriarch's summons to give heed to what he is going to say, we usually find a description of one or more episodes of the patriarch's life. Together with a number of references to what Joseph did, they serve as illustrations for the parenesis which follows. The sons should follow the good example of the patriarch (and/or Joseph) or avoid his sins. Particular sins and virtues are connected with certain patriarchs, and consequently the exhortatory passages in the Testaments taken together give a colourful spectrum of virtues and vices within the framework of the general admonitions to obey the law of God and the commandments of the patriarch, and to show love and compassion to one's neighbour.

There are exceptions to the rule. The biographical details in T. Levi are mostly connected with his exploits at Shechem (chs vi-vii), his visions (chs ii-iii and viii), and his installation as priest (ch. ix); there is hardly any parenesis proper (ch. xiii!). Here, no doubt, the influence of an earlier Levi-document is visible. T. Asher does not give any biographical information, apart from the general remark in v4, that in all his life he did not wander from the truth of the Lord and searched out the commandments of the Most High. Benjamin, in a way, does nothing but mirror Joseph's virtues. His sons should imitate 'the good and holy man' Joseph (iii2). The author(s) was (were) clearly restricted by the traditional material at his (their) disposal, in the Bible as well as from other sources.

At the end of the parenetic section all the Testaments have a prediction or predictions concerning the future of the tribe of the patriarch (comp. Gen. 49. 1; 50. 24 f.). It will go astray either in its rebellion against Levi and Judah (some L. J. passages), or in apostasy as it forgets the Lord's commandments and is punished and led into exile (S.E.R. passages). The final note, however, is always one of peace and salvation. Here again a great variety in form and content can be observed.

³⁵ *Das Bundesformular* (W.M.A.N.T. 4) (Neukirchen, 1969), particularly pp. 142-70.

³⁶ 'The Genre Testament and Forecasts of the Future in the Hellenistic Milieu', *J.S.J.* vi (1975), 57-71 and 'The Genre Testament and the Testament of Abraham' in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Studies on the Testament of Abraham* (S.B.L. Septuagint and cognate Studies 6) (Missoula, 1976), 139-52.

³⁷ *Los Discursos de Adiós de Gn a Jn 13-17* (Barcelona, 1976).

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs were written with a parenetic purpose, and (nearly) all individual Testaments centre on the hortatory passages. The lives of the patriarchs provide examples, to be followed or to be avoided. The predictions concerning the future show what will happen to people who obey or disobey God's commandments.

3. *The parenesis in the Testaments*

Much could and should be said on the parenesis of the Testaments. First of all I would like to stress that it cannot be called 'typically' Jewish or 'typically' Christian. The scholar who looks for parallels will find them in the Wisdom-books of the Septuagint, particularly in Ecclesiastes, Proverbs and Jesus Sirach, and, to a lesser extent, in the Wisdom of Solomon and IV Maccabees, and also in other Jewish-Hellenistic literature (Philo, Josephus). In a number of cases he will only find them in ethical writings of Hellenistic philosophers or in Christian parenesis of the second and early third centuries (which is in many ways not 'typically' Christian either).³⁸

The ethics of the Testaments are 'general' rather than 'particular'. With regard to Jewish customs, for instance, it is significant that they nowhere teach the observance of the sabbath, or of circumcision, or of the dietary laws. Marriage with gentile women is forbidden in the case of Levi (T. Levi ix 10) and predicted among the sins of the sons of Levi (xiv 6) – both passages may ultimately go back to the Aramaic Levi-document – and Judah emphasizes the troubles he got into when he wanted the Canaanite Bathshuah. In the parenetic sections, however, the author warns against women in general, but not against gentile women in particular. Joseph is the example of a man who remains faithful to the God of his fathers in the midst of temptation and persecution. In the end he marries the daughter of his masters (xviii 3) and becomes a powerful man in Egypt. No special stipulations with regard to Joseph's wife are mentioned.

I would like to go into more detail here, but can only refer to my treatment of T. Issachar as 'typical testament' in a contribution to the *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* published in 1975.³⁹ There I have tried to show the unity of the biographical passages in the testament; their close link with the virtues recommended here: ἐγκράτεια and ἀπλότης; the relative usefulness of form-critical analysis in the study of chapters iii and iv as well as of vii 1–7; the link between the parenesis and the following S.E.R. passage in chapter vi; stressing in all this the unity within the variety. Here, and far

³⁸ See the article by H. C. Kee mentioned in note 30 and the contribution by Harm W. Hollander mentioned in note 34, as well as a forthcoming study by Hollander on the ethics of the Testaments.

³⁹ Chapter xvii, 'Testament Issachar als "typisches Testament"'. Einige Bemerkungen zu zwei neuen Uebersetzungen der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen.' Here I deal with the translations of B. Otzen in *De Gammeltestamentlige Pseudepigrapher* 7 (København, 1974), 677–789 and of J. Becker in *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, iii, 1 (Gütersloh, 1974), 17–163; also with J. Becker's influential monograph, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (A.G.J.U. 8) (Leiden, 1970).

more elsewhere, the modern reader would have preferred a clearer separation of parenesis and illustration, and a clearer structuring of the biographical and hortatory material and of the predictions. I do not think, however, that our need for more consistency must lead us to the reconstruction of an original kernel-testament and the hypothesis of subsequent accretions and redactions.

4. *The predictions of the future*

There is a great variety in the passages of the Testaments dealing with the future. Two regularly recurring 'patterns' can be distinguished, and the S.E.R. passages as well as the L.J. passages have been studied in detail by several scholars, the latter particularly in connection with the expectations found in Qumran concerning an ideal High Priest and a Davidic prince. Far less attention has been paid to the fact that these patterns are very unevenly distributed over the individual testaments and are adapted to the different contexts; sometimes we find one pattern combined with elements of the other, or one pattern recurring twice (in the case of T. Levi x, xiv-xv, xvi the S.E.R. pattern is even repeated three times). In 1953 I also distinguished passages dealing with the Messiah (among them are the well-known chapters T. Levi xviii and T. Judah xxiv) and passages dealing with the resurrection,⁴⁰ but both of these groups of passages are so heterogeneous that it is not possible to speak of common patterns.

In these passages concerning the future, the patently Christian elements are numerous and prominent. The resulting picture is complicated, and it is not surprising that many scholars have tried to solve the difficulties by literary-critical methods. There is almost unanimous agreement on the removal of Christian interpolations and alterations. But even if these are removed, the remaining text shows so many unevennesses that it is still thought necessary to argue for different stages of redaction or extensive interpolations in an original document (so, for instance, J. Becker),⁴¹ or, if doubts are felt about cutting the text too drastically, to regard the present variety as the outcome of a complicated process of reaction to historical circumstances and development of eschatological ideas in a particular group (so now A. Hultgård).⁴²

I admire the courage and the ingenuity of these and other scholars, but do not share their optimism concerning the possibilities of tracing the literary history of the Testaments and the development of traditions before and during the genesis of this writing. I am even less optimistic about the possibility of tracing the situations and different *Sitze im Leben* resulting in the development of traditions. Interpreters of a piece of literature should concentrate on the text before them and try to make sense out of it. If, as is clearly the case with the Testaments, authors have collected and used older traditions, we must carefully bring together all possible parallels and compare these with the

⁴⁰ See pp. 89-96.

⁴¹ See note 39.

⁴² See note 25.

pertinent clauses or passages in our document. In doing that, we shall notice that it is much easier to note the particular features of the use of the material in our document than to trace the process leading up to those particular features. I cannot help feeling that most scholars (and I do not want to exclude myself) want to know too much. They invent and utilize an impressive array of tools, but simplify things tremendously during their analysis. This is, probably, unavoidable; let us, however, remain cautious and admit that there is a lot we do not know and will never be in a position to know until new evidence becomes available.

These admonitions should, of course, be followed by some suggestions as to how we can make progress notwithstanding the many pitfalls on our way. I shall attempt to give these in connection with the last subject to be treated in this paper: the patently Christian elements.

IV. THE PATENTLY CHRISTIAN ELEMENTS

All investigations on the Testaments have to start from the text as we can reconstruct it in its earliest accessible form with the methods of textual criticism. As we have seen in section I, this is a Christian text of an uncertain date. The question is now: are we able to take two steps back? First to the (Christian) text known to Origen, and next to a Hellenistic-Jewish one supposedly used and reworked (in one way or another) by Christians in the second century?

It is essential to realize that there are in fact *two* steps to be taken. If we feel compelled to regard certain passages or expressions as later glosses or additions to an earlier text, we must consider the possibility that they came into the text in the period between the end of the second century and the time of the origin of the archetype of the present manuscript tradition. That is to say: they may be Christian additions to a Christian document; we may not regard them as proofs for the hypothesis that there must have been an earlier process of Christianization of a once purely Jewish document.

Next, we should be cautious with the use of the words Jewish and Christian in this connection. For an answer to the question whether the Testaments are Jewish or Christian, we can only use distinctively Christian and distinctively Jewish passages. If, for instance, the Testaments give much biographical material on the patriarchs, partly taken from the Old Testament and partly derived from Jewish sources and haggadic traditions, this does not prove that the Testaments are Jewish. It may be difficult to imagine how a Christian could have collected so much variegated Jewish material, but the fact that it is found in the Testaments does not make that writing Jewish, nor does it compel us to assume a distinctively Jewish stage in the making of this writing.

The same applies to the parenetic sections of the book. As I have already remarked above (III, §3), they contain little or nothing that is distinctively

Jewish or Christian. Now, the biographical passages serve as an introduction to and as an illustration of the parenesis, and the parenesis can only take a specific colouring within the specific setting in which it functions. In the case of the Testaments this means that the result of the analysis of the predictions of the future is really decisive in the matter of provenance.⁴³

Unfortunately, the passages in the Testaments dealing with the future are the most complicated of all, as I have indicated already (III, §4). I think we may state the problem in the following terms. The predictions of the future show a great variety in form and content, with many Christian elements at 'strategic' places. We must in any case speak of a Christian *redaction* of the Testaments; we cannot assume, however, that the compilation/redaction of the twelve testaments coincided with the Christian redaction. On the other hand it is difficult to prove beyond doubt that there must have been an intermediary Jewish-Hellenistic stage and, particularly, to reconstruct its wording and content. Let me illustrate this with two examples.

In T. Asher VII we find a double S.E.R. passage. In the first half (vv. 1-3) we hear that Asher's sons will be scattered to the four corners of the earth, 'until the Most High will visit the earth' (v. 2). This visitation is described in Christian terms: 'and He, coming as a man, eating and drinking with men, and breaking silently the head of the dragon through water, will in this way save Israel and all the nations, God playing the rôle of a man' (v. 3).⁴⁴ Asher admonishes his children not to be disobedient (v. 4), for he has read in the heavenly tables that they will be disobedient to him (= Christ), and act ungodly towards him, not giving heed to the law of God but to the commandments of men (v. 5). Therefore another dispersion will follow (v. 6), 'until the Lord will gather you together in faith through the hope of his tender mercy, for the sake of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob' (v. 7). Now, whatever may have been the prehistory of this text, it makes good sense as it stands; and the duplication of the S.E.R. pattern serves the undoubtedly Christian view on the history of the tribe of Asher as part of the people of Israel, which we find expressed in this chapter.

Much more complicated is the situation in T. Levi. In the first vision of Levi (which, ultimately, goes back to Aramaic Levi), all attention is focused on Levi's priesthood; the angel also tells the patriarch that he is to announce 'him who will redeem Israel' (II 10). Next follows, rather unexpectedly, an L.J. passage in v. 11: 'And through you and Judah the Lord will appear among men, saving through them every race of men.' Verse 11 may have been added at a later stage, yet we should observe that in v. 10 the reference to the redeemer of Israel fits quite organically in its immediate context as well as in T. Levi as a whole. In IV 3 we hear that Levi will be as a light in Jacob and as the sun for Israel, but only 'until the Lord will visit all the nations in

⁴³ On this see also H. D. Slingerland's survey of research, mentioned in note 31, pp. 108-12.

⁴⁴ On the expression θεός εἰς ἄνθρωπον ὑποκρινόμενος see M. de Jonge in *Studies*, 243-4.

the mercies of his Son for ever' (v. 4). Levi's sons will kill him and, therefore, Levi has to instruct them concerning him (vv. 4-5).

In T. Levi x, xiv-xv and xvi we find three S.E.R. passages. The sins of the sons of Levi 'against the saviour of the world' (x2, xix2) will be a sign of their contempt for the Law and the words of the prophets (xvi2); 'a man who renews the Law in the power of the Most High you will call a deceiver' (xvi3). The result is that Israel is led astray (x2) and that the nations will no longer be able to follow the light of the sons of Levi (xiv3-4). The patriarch refuses to take any responsibility for these sins (x2) and also 'our father Israel' will have nothing to do with the ungodliness of the high priests (xiv2). The sins of the sons of Levi are sins against the Law, and sins against him who was sent to renew the Law and to save the world. However, the sons of Levi will be saved in the end when 'he shall visit (you) again and in pity will receive you in faith and water' (xiv5). The new high priest of the future, described in T. Levi xviii, will be one to whom all the words of the Lord will be revealed and who will judge and instruct the entire world (vv. 2-4; compare iv3-4, xiv3-4 with xviii3-4!). It is not said that this new priest will come from the tribe of Levi. In the description of his work we should further note v. 9: 'and during his priesthood the nations will be multiplied in knowledge upon the earth and enlightened through the grace of the Lord' with the remarkable negative correlate: 'but Israel shall be diminished in ignorance and will be darkened in sorrow'.

Like the sons of Asher the sons of Levi will refuse to accept Christ – although Levi, like other patriarchs, has warned them beforehand. Because of the special mission given to Levi, the sin of the sons of Levi is especially great. On the other hand it is stated that Levi's mission is confined to the time before the coming of Christ (compare T. Reuben vi8). Yet there is salvation even for those who have erred, 'because of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob' (T. Levi xv4 and T. Asher vii7).

One of the few scholars who in recent times has taken the Testaments seriously as part of early Christian literature, J. Jervell,⁴⁵ has tried to show that in many passages of the Testaments the salvation for the nations is taken for granted, whereas the position of Israel presents a problem. For the Testaments history – seen in the perspective of 'Sin-Exile-Return' – has repeated itself. The sinfulness of Israel has become evident again in the rejection of Jesus Christ, new punishment and exile have followed. But just as Israel was rescued before, it will also be saved in the future. The God of Israel has given salvation to the Gentiles; if Israel proves itself obedient to the Law, and to Jesus Christ as renewer of the Law, it will receive its share in God's future for the world.

⁴⁵ See his contribution 'Ein Interpolator interpretiert. Zu der christlichen Bearbeitung der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen', 30-61, in C. Burchard-J. Jervell-Joh. Thomas, *Studien zu den Testamenten der zwölf Patriarchen* (B.Z.N.W. 36) (Berlin, 1969).

I disagree with Jervell on a number of points, particularly because he still thinks in terms of interpolation and redaction of a previous Jewish work. His general approach, however, is very important, because it shows that the future destiny of Israel can remain the concern of an author or authors who have accepted Jesus Christ as saviour of the world. I shall not go into a number of other questions (e.g. the christology and the date of the first redaction, later Christian additions) raised and answered by Jervell. Several problems will, probably, turn out to be much more complicated than he thinks – but if the solution to the problem of the origin of the Testaments is to be found anywhere, it is along the lines suggested by him.

Yet it remains uncertain whether the present Christian document is the outcome of a thoroughgoing redaction of a preceding Hellenistic-Jewish compilation/redaction of twelve testaments. It is clear that no Christian author would have given his view on the future of Israel and mankind in the context of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, if he had not known much material on the sons of Jacob that he could use. His work can only be explained as the result of thoroughgoing adaptation and redaction of earlier Jewish material. But in the case of T. Levi, for instance, it is difficult to decide whether 1110^b, 144–5, and the present text of the important chapters x, xiv–xvi and xviii are the result of an editorial activity directly on the basis of the earlier Levi-material or of a Hellenistic-Jewish Testament of Levi which had already incorporated that material. It is reasonable to suppose that the idea of composing testaments of the twelve sons of Jacob, giving biographical anecdotes illustrating ethical instructions followed by predictions of the future in which the consequences of obedience and disobedience to God will become evident, was already conceived by Jews. It is difficult, however, to prove the existence of such Jewish testaments, and it is practically impossible to determine their content.

CONCLUSION

Many problems are still open. Progress in solving them can be made, however, if we concentrate on:

- (a) a thoroughgoing analysis of the present Testaments as an early Christian document, trying to find the inner logic of its views on Jesus Christ, Israel and the nations;
- (b) a comprehensive study of the parenesis of the Testaments;
- (c) a continued search for and new analysis of non-parenetic parallel material in order to gain better insight into the prehistory of the Testaments.

THE FUTURE OF ISRAEL IN THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

1. Introduction

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs purport to transmit the parting words of the twelve sons of Jacob addressed to their descendants. All emphasis lies on the exhortations, illustrated by positive or negative examples taken from the life of the patriarch concerned or by references to Joseph's virtuous behaviour. The exhortations are meant to be handed down to future generations who have to be warned and are called to repentance (T.S. 7,3; T.L. 10,1f; T.D. 6, 9; T.N. 8,1f; T.B. 10,4f). The patriarchs know that they will sin and will be in all kinds of distress because of that (T.L. 10,2; T.I. 6,3; T.N. 4,1). Only if the descendants of all generations obey God's commandments and those of their fathers will they have a share in the future salvation (T.D. 6,9; T.N. 8,2; T.G. 8,1; T.B. 10,5)¹).

There is a direct connection between the exhortations and the predictions of the future. The Testaments are very much interested in the future of Israel; they not only look ahead at the events between the fictitious and the actual time of writing (and reading) but also deal with the final destiny of Israel (often represented by the descendants of the patriarch in question).

If we examine the passages concerned, together with related statements, we find a great variety of expressions and concepts. In a number of cases only Israel is mentioned, particularly in the Return element in some of the Sin-Exile-Return passages²) (T.L.

¹) See H. W. HOLLANDER, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (StVTPs 6), Leiden 1981, chapter 1, and, also, E. von NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Alten I* (ALGHJ 13), Leiden 1980, esp. pp. 97-98.

²) Sin-Exile-Return (S.E.R.) passages and Levi-Judah (L.J.) passages were distinguished and described for the first time by the present author in his *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A study of their Text, Composition and Origin*, Assen

16,5; T.I. 6,4; T.A. 7,7; cf. T.Z. 10,2 after 9,9). In the Exile element of those passages the Gentiles are the enemies of Israel, instrumental in its punishment (T.L. 10,4; 15,1-3; 16,5; T. Jud. 23,3f; T.I. 6,2; T.Z. 9,6; T.D. 5,8; T.N. 4,2; T.A. 7,2); they are also the paradigm of immorality in T. Jud. 23,2; T.D. 5,5; T.N. 3,3; 4,1; T. Jos. 4,5. Sometimes the Gentiles (or the righteous outside Israel) appear beside Israel. Mostly Israel is mentioned first (T.L. 5,7; T. Jud. 22,2; 25,5; T.D. 6,7; T.N. 8,3; T.A. 7,3; T.B. 9,2), but a few times, suprisingly, the reverse order is found (T.S. 7,2; T.N. 4,5; T. Jos. 19,6; T.B. 3,8b). Next, there are a great number of passages speaking about the salvation of "mankind" or "the nations" in general without any special mention of Israel (T.R. 6,11; T.S. 6,5-7; T.L. 2,11 (after 2,10!); 4,4 (after 4,3!); 10,2; 14,2; (17,2); T. Jud. 24,6; T.Z. 9,8; T.D. 5,11 (followed, however, by v. 13); T. Jos. 19,4 (but see v. 6); T.B. 3,8a (cf. v. 8b); 10,5). Only few passages speak about final punishment and condemnation. T.S. 6, 3,4 mention the punishment of specific nations: Canaan, Amalek, the Cappadocians and the Hittites in the context of the glorification of Shem and the salvation of mankind. T.B. 10,9 limits condemnation to "all the Gentiles, as many as did not believe him when he appeared on earth". This verse stands in between v. 8 announcing judgment on Israel which did not believe in Christ, and verse 10 which specifies that the Lord will convict Israel through the chosen ones of the Gentiles. The impression is that Israel will be judged collectively; yet v. 11 assures the sons of Benjamin that there is hope for them if they walk in holiness before the Lord; in that case all Israel will be gathered together unto the Lord. Finally, there is T.L. 18,9 which announces that in the time of the ideal priest of the future, the Gentiles will be multiplied in knowledge on the earth and will be enlightened, but Israel will be diminished through ignorance and darkened in sorrow.

Is it possible to explain this variety and to detect a consistent view on Israel's final destiny? Or should we speak of differences in the Testaments on this point, to be explained by interpolations or a more thorough redactional activity in the course of the history of this document? Recently, J. JERVELL has argued that all univer-

1953. For a detailed analysis see H. W. HOLLANDER and M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary* (StVTPs 8), Leiden 1985, INTRODUCTION 4.4; 7.2 and 7.3.

salist statements are to be ascribed to the final, Christian, stage in the redaction of the Testaments³). A. HULTGÅRD comes to the conclusion that the universalist element became gradually stronger in the course of the Jewish transmission of this writing, to be accentuated and turned in a Christian direction once the Testaments were taken over by the church⁴). On this as on other aspects of the passages dealing with the future in the Testaments there is much difference of opinion amongst interpreters, and in view of the necessarily speculative nature of the efforts at reconstructing the various stages in their "prehistory" this is not surprising. It seems wiser to regard the text as it lies before us⁵) as a composition in its own right—whether it is the result of an (in any case thorough) redaction of an earlier Jewish-Hellenistic writing or must be regarded as a Christian document incorporating much traditional Jewish material⁶). The aim of the present investigation, then, is to examine a number of the most important statements afresh in the context of the passages in which they occur, in order to show that the present Christian Testaments present a view on the future of Israel which is more consistent than is often thought.

First, we shall discuss the position of Israel in a number of passages dealing with the future resurrection of the patriarchs. Second, some remarks will be made on the Sin-Exile-Return passages; the repetition of the pattern in the Testament of Levi on the one hand, and in the Testaments of Zebulun, Naphtali and Asher on the other, will receive special attention. Third, we shall look at some Levi-Judah passages and, finally, a special discussion will be devoted to the complex passage T.D. 5,10-6,10. A concluding section will sum up our results⁷).

³) "Ein Interpolator interpretiert", in Chr. BURCHARD-J. JERVELL-J. THOMAS, *Studien zu den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen* (BZNW 36), Berlin 1964, pp. 30-61.

⁴) See his "L'Universalisme des Test. XII Patr." in *Ex Orbe Religionum*. Studia Geo Widengren oblata I (Suppl. to Numen 21), Leiden 1972, pp. 192-207. For a (hypothetical) reconstruction of different stages in the eschatology of the Testaments, see his *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches I* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 6), Uppsala 1977.

⁵) I use the new critical edition by M. DE JONGE, H. W. HOLLANDER, H. J. DE JONGE and Th. KORTEWEG, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PsVTGr I, 2), Leiden 1978.

⁶) For a defence of this approach see M. DE JONGE, "The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *NTS* 26 (1979-80), pp. 508-524.

⁷) For a more detailed discussion of the passages involved see the *Commentary* mentioned in n. 2.

2. *The passages dealing with the future resurrection of the Patriarchs*

A number of passages in the Testaments announce the future resurrection of the sons of Jacob, together with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and other "saints" belonging to the pre-mosaic period. In a recent article⁸⁾ I have tried to show that the views found in the Testaments agree with those of Justin and Irenaeus (and others) on the "patriarchs" as exemplary servants of God. They obeyed the essentials of God's law summed up by Jesus Christ, the new lawgiver, in the two great commandments of love towards God and one's neighbour. The exhortations of the sons of Jacob concentrate on these essentials of the law and it does not come as a surprise, then, that T.Z. 10,2 announces Zebulun's resurrection among his sons, and his rejoicing in the midst of his tribe, "as many as have kept the law of the Lord and the commandments of Zebulun their father". T. Judah 25,5 at the end of a full description of the final resurrection includes "all peoples" who "will glorify the Lord for ever", and T.B. 10,4-11 (referred to above) mentions observance of God's commandments (vv. 5; 11) beside believing in God's coming on earth in Jesus Christ (vv. 7-9). The last passage follows on the announcement of the patriarch's imminent death (v. 2) and a final exhortation to obey God's commandments. Benjamin pictures himself (and his brothers) as successor(s) to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob who handed down the commandments as a spiritual legacy, and asked their descendants to obey them "until the Lord would reveal his salvation to all the nations..." (v. 5). Enoch, Noah, Shem and the three patriarchs mentioned will rise, followed by the twelve sons of Jacob, each over his own tribe, "worshipping the king of heaven, who appeared on earth in the form of a man of humility" (vv. 6-7). In fact, "as many as believed in him on earth will rejoice with him" (v. 7b).

Belief in God's appearance on earth in the form of a man is the criterion according to which Israelites *and* Gentiles will be judged (vv. 8-9). As we have already seen, the wording of v. 8 suggests that Israel as a whole treated Jesus Christ unrighteously; yet v. 11, repeating the exhortation to the sons of Benjamin, assures that in

⁸⁾ "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus", *Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985), pp. 157-170.

this way "all Israel will be gathered unto the Lord" (cf. 9,2). God's final salvation is promised to all people who believe in God and Jesus Christ and who obey the essential commandments. The Testaments, related to the twelve sons of Jacob, emphasize Israel's special responsibility towards God and Jesus Christ, but do not call into question Israel's share in the final salvation.

3. *The Sin-Exile-Return-passages*

The so-called S.E.R. passages (see e.g. T.I. 6) announce that the sons of the patriarchs will sin, will be dispersed among the Gentiles and oppressed by their enemies until they are allowed to return to their country. Sometimes (as in T.I. 6,3), we hear that they will repent, and will be brought back because of that. As O. H. STECK has shown⁹⁾, these passages represent an eschatological variant of the deuteronomistic view of history. This pattern serves the purpose of the Testaments well: it can be used to cover the entire period between the times of the patriarchs and the present, it may be repeated, and it is suited to describe eschatological judgment and salvation. It serves to stress the importance of obedience to God's commandments and the necessity of repentance. All along, the inner coherence of the three (four) elements sin, punishment, (repentance) and return/salvation is clearer than the exact historical references¹⁰⁾; the circumstances may vary, the principle remains the same. This becomes very clear in those testaments where the pattern occurs more than once.

There are, for instance, no less than three S.E.R. passages in T. Levi, in chapters 10; 14-15, and they are clearly related; the repetition serves here to underscore the point the author wants to make. In all cases the sins are clearly those of the priests of the tribe of Levi against Jesus Christ. Elsewhere I have given a more detailed ex-

⁹⁾ In his *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten* (WMANT 23), Neukirchen 1967, pp. 149-153. See also J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (AGJU 8), Leiden 1970, pp. 172-177 and A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie I* (see n. 4), pp. 82-174.

¹⁰⁾ In the descriptions of sins, in particular, many stereotypes are found. It is, therefore, impossible to connect these with the reports about transgressions of the Hellenizers in Jerusalem at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes or about the wickedness of some Hasmonean priest-kings which are found in other sources.

position of these chapters¹¹); for the purpose of the present article it will be sufficient to describe their main features.

In view of the Qumran fragment 4Q Test Levi^a 8 iii which shows some points of agreement with 14,3f¹²) it is often thought that chapters 14-15 follow the text of an earlier Levi-document known to the author responsible for the present testament. In view of the fragmentary nature of the parallel text, however, very little can be said about this "Vorlage" with certainty. The term "you will act ungodly against the Lord" in 14,1 is commented upon in v. 2; the ἀσεβεία under discussion is that of the highpriests who lay their hands ἐπὶ τὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου¹³). Because of their wickedness they will no longer be able to spread their light, the light of the law, in the world (vv. 3-4). A long catalogue of sins follows in vv. 5-8; they are described in general terms and cannot be connected with any period in the history of the priesthood. The Exile section speaks about the devastation of God's temple, about captivity among the Gentiles, and dishonour and shame (15, 1-3, cf. also 14,1). A proper Return passage is missing, probably because the pattern is going to be repeated in chapter 16 which ends with a reference to God's compassion. In 15,4 we hear, however, that because of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (cf. T.A. 7,7) Levi's seed will not be destroyed completely.

T.L. 10 is separated from T.L. 14-15 by the chapters 11-13 for which clear parallels exist in the Aramaic fragments found in the Cairo Genizah¹⁴); the chapter itself, unlike those just mentioned and the preceding chapter 9, has no Aramaic equivalent. It may, therefore, be a free composition of the author of the Testaments. In 10,2 the patriarch declares that he does not accept any responsibility for the wickedness and transgression which his sons, at the consummation of the ages, will commit against the saviour of the world (εἰς τὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου). The Lord will not tolerate this wickedness, he will rend the covering of the temple "so as not to

¹¹) See my "Levi, the Sons of Levi and the Law in T. Levi X, XIV-XV and XVI" in J. DORÉ, P. GRELOT, M. CARREZ (ed.), *De la Tōrah au Messie* (Mélanges H. Cazelles), Paris 1981, pp. 513-523.

¹²) See J. T. MILIK, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrān Cave 4*, Oxford 1976, pp. 23-4.

¹³) See also τοῦτον θέλοντες ἀνελεῖν in v. 4.

¹⁴) See R. H. CHARLES, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford 1908, Appendix III.

cover your shame'' (v. 3)¹⁵). Dispersion and captivity will follow (v. 4). As at the end of ch. 14-15 there is no reference to salvation or return. In chapter 16, the third and only complete S.E.R. passage, the sins of the priestly sons of Levi against Jesus Christ are mentioned at the end of a list of sins in which transgressions against prophets and righteous men (vv. 1-3) figure prominently. Jesus is called "a man who renews the law in the power of the Most High". The sons of Levi will kill him "taking innocent blood ... on your heads" (cf. Mt 23,35; 27,4; 25; Acts 5,28). God's punishment consists in the destruction of the temple and the dispersion of the sons of Levi. The entire cycle ends with the promise that "he will again visit (you) and in pity receive you through faith and water".

The author leaves no doubt about the nature of the sins of the sons of Levi; the priests in Israel will be particularly hostile to Jesus Christ and will kill him (see also 4,4b); therefore the temple veil will be rent, and the temple itself will be destroyed. Repetition is used here as a deliberate editorial device to stress the things that are important. Levi is glorified as a priest (see the visions in chapters 2-5 and 8). He and his sons have been appointed to spread God's light, the light of the law, in the entire world (4,3f; 14,3f; cf. 8,2.13 and T.R. 6,8), but the period of Levi's activity is limited (see 4,4 "...until the Lord will visit all the nations in the tender mercies of his son for ever"; 5,2: "...until I come and sojourn in the midst of Israel"; cf., again, T.R. 6,8). Levi's sons will sin and betray their calling, notwithstanding their solemn promise in 19,1-3. Only after a long period, cryptically described in T.L. 17, the Lord will raise a new priest—who is nowhere said to come from the tribe of Levi¹⁶—and God's light will shine again (18,2-3.9). Levi announces the coming of this priest himself at the end of this testament (cf. also 8,14). The patriarch says expressly that his sons will not be excluded from God's salvation (15,4 and 16,5). In 2,10 it is said that Levi will proclaim concerning the one who will redeem *Israel*, identified as "the Lord who appears among men through Levi and Judah", i.e. Jesus Christ (see section 4 below). On the

¹⁵) This is an interesting variant in a complex of early Christian interpretations of the rending of the temple veil recorded in *Mk* 15,38 par. See H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary* (see n. 2), INTRODUCTION 8.5.

¹⁶) In fact, 8,14 tells us: "a king will arise from Judah and will establish a new priesthood after the fashion of the Gentiles for all the Gentiles (or: nations)".

other hand T.L. 18,9 excludes Israel from the light of knowledge spread by the new priest. "Israel will be diminished through ignorance and will be darkened in sorrow" (cf. also 4,6).

The emphasis in the S.E.-S.E.(R.)-S.E.R. cycle in T. Levi is clearly on the sins of the priestly leaders of Israel against God and Jesus Christ. Their hostility symbolizes Israel's refusal to accept Jesus Christ as redeemer (2,10f) and its exclusion from the final salvation. And yet, the announcements of the sins that will be committed all through the history of Israel and against Jesus Christ are also meant as a warning (see 10,1-2). The sons should give heed to the glorious example of their father, whose task (also their task) will be taken over by a new priest. And this S.E.R. cycle too, ends with the assurance that God will be compassionate towards the sons of the patriarch.

The repetition of the S.E.R. pattern in T.Z. 9(-10); T.N. 4 and T.A. 7 is of a somewhat different nature; it serves to show that history repeats itself. In T.Z. 9 the S.E.R.-passage (which includes a clause on repentance) in vv. 5-7 is followed by v. 8, a clearly Christian verse which connects a number of elements found in "Saviour"-passages¹⁷) with the Return element. V. 9 mentions new sins—against Jesus Christ ("you will provoke him")—and new punishment ("you will be cast away"). This will last *ἕως καιροῦ συντελείας*; this evidently refers to the resurrection of the patriarchs and their faithful descendants, and the final judgment mentioned in T.Z. 10,1-3.

Also in T.A. 7 the first Return element is connected with Jesus Christ. The dispersion is said to last "until the Most High will visit the earth" (v. 2), explained as "and he, coming as a man, eating and drinking with men and in silence breaking the head of the dragon through water, will, in this way, save Israel and all the Gentiles, God playing the part of a man" (v. 3). Asher cautions his sons not to be disobedient to him (v. 4), for he has read in the heavenly

¹⁷) Two passages which are closely related, T.L. 18 and T.Jud. 24 and give a picture of an ideal "saviour"-figure which is to come. T.Z. 9,8 and T.D. 5,10-13 give only brief descriptions using elements found in the two larger passages. All of them are in one way or another connected with a S.E.R. passage (see also below). T.L. 18 follows on a pessimistic picture of Israel's history in T.L. 17. This chapter ends with a description of the seventh jubilee in vv. 8-11 according to a S.E.R. pattern, followed by the announcement of punishment in 18,1 and the description of the activity of the new priest in the rest of chapter 18.

tablets that they will do just that: ἀσεβοῦντες ἀσεβήσετε εἰς αὐτόν (cf. T.L. 10,2; 14,1f). A new dispersion will follow until "the Lord will gather you in faith through the hope of his compassion for the sake of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (v. 7). There is hope for the sons of Asher, as well as for the sons of Levi (cf. especially 15,4), and, indeed, for the entire people of Israel.

The repetition of the S.E.R. pattern in T.N. 4 poses a number of problems. The first passage (vv. 1-3) uses the second person plural (as might be expected), but in the second (vv. 4-5) the third person plural is found. Although similar changes occur elsewhere (T.L. 19,2f; T.Jud. 21,5-6; T.I. 5,4f) one might suppose that vv. 4-5 were added later. The two passages correspond, however, to the two visions which follow in chapters 5 and 6 which go back to an earlier Naphtali-document¹⁸). Chapters 5 and 6 are clearly connected with chapter 4 (see the γάρ in 5,1). We should note that 5,8 (which was not taken over from the earlier document) mentions exile, but no restauration, and that the concluding verses of the second vision (6,9-10) announce peace and joy after the reunion of Jacob with his dispersed sons. In 7,1 Jacob regards the two dreams as a unity and concludes "that those things will be fulfilled after Israel has endured many things". It is possible, and even probable, that the author of the present testament took over two parallel visions relating to the same event (so Hebr. T.N. 3,13; 7,4), but regarded them as referring to subsequent stages of the history of Israel¹⁹). He introduced them with a double S.E.R. passage. The second Return element in T.N. 4,5 is obviously Christian. The sons of Naphtali will be dispersed "until the compassion of the Lord comes, a man working righteousness and compassion unto all who are far off and who are near"—a clear reference to the coming of Jesus Christ for the Gentiles and Israel (in this order! cf. Isa 57,19 referred to in Eph. 2,17).

In the passages discussed here patently Christian elements are found in strategic places; there is much variety, but also a consis-

¹⁸) On the relationship between the Greek T. Naphtali and its Hebrew counterpart (printed as Appendix II in Charles's edition of 1908, see n. 14) see Th. KORTEWEG, "The Meaning of Naphtali's Visions" in M. DE JONGE (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation* (StVTPs 3), Leiden 1975, pp. 261-290.

¹⁹) So KORTEWEG in the article mentioned in n. 18, pp. 266f.

tent interest in Israel's part in God's final salvation after the coming of Jesus Christ. In addition, we should note that the S.E.R. passage T.Jud. (18,1) 23,1-5 is followed by the "Saviour"-passage chapter 24 which gives the picture of Jesus Christ as the ideal son of Judah. The Return element in 23,5b is interpreted by what follows; in 24,6 the world-wide character of Jesus' kingship receives due attention, but in 24,2f the patriarch assures his sons that they will receive "the spirit of grace" from him who is to come and that they will be his sons²⁰). In T.D. 5,9 the Repentance-Return element at the end of the complicated S.E.R. passage vv. 4a-5, 6-9 is followed by a "Saviour"-passage introduced by a Judah-Levi formula in v. 10a. This introduction as well as the description of the activity of the saviour in vv. 10b-13 refer to Jesus Christ, as comparison with T.Jud. 24; T.Z. 9,8 and also T.L. 18 shows (see also sections 4 and 5 below). The only S.E.R. passage which does not have a Christian clause or a commentary at the end is T.I. 6,1-4, the end of which only mentions the Lord's mercy in bringing the sons of the patriarch back to their country. Only later, at the end of 7,7, do we find the only clearly Christian element in the entire testament.

4. *Some Levi-Judah passages*

The passages speaking about Levi and Judah predict future rebellion on the part of the patriarchs' sons against these two tribes and/or exhort these sons to obey them. Levi and Judah have to be obeyed, and rebellion will fail, because of their special position granted and guaranteed by God *and* because God's salvation in the future is directly connected with these two tribes. Elsewhere (as we have just seen) the Testaments criticize the sons of Levi and the sons of Judah (T.L. 10; 14-15; 16; T.Jud. 23, cf. also T.Jud. 21,6-22,2 and T.D. 5,6-9). Yet they expect the definitive restitution of the true priesthood and the true royal authority (T.L. 18; T.Jud. 24, cf. 22,3). In a similar way the Levi-Judah passages speak about God's special care and promise for the priestly and the royal tribe.

For the purpose of this article we concentrate on those L.J. passages that are evidently concerned with the last stages in God's

²⁰) We should note that here Judah's sons receive special mention, whereas the sons of Levi do not occur in the equally universalistic chapter T.L. 18.

dealings with mankind. All passages which connect God's final salvation with the tribes of Levi and Judah refer to Jesus Christ, but in a variety of ways. T.S. 7,1-2 (immediately following on the clearly Christian verses 6,6-7 which, amongst other things, mention Simeon's resurrection) connect salvation (*ἀνατελεῖ* ... τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ) with the two tribes; yet the first half of the verse is so formulated that redemption (*λυτρωθήσεσθε*; cf. T.L. 2,10f; T.Z. 9,8) is especially related to Judah. God's salvation is effected through God's raising up "someone as a highpriest" from Levi and "someone as a king" from Judah. Jesus Christ, "God and man", is evidently meant; he will save "all the Gentiles and the race of Israel"—in this order. T.L. 2,11 specifies that "the one who will redeem Israel" is the Lord himself, appearing among men "by you (= Levi) and Judah ... saving through them every race of men".

T.Jud. 22,2 at the end of a long passage which describes the sins of the sons of Judah announces the end of Judah's kingship among men of other nations "until the salvation of Israel comes, until the appearing of the God of righteousness, to give Jacob rest and peace, and all the Gentiles"—in the following verse it becomes clear that God's promises concerning Judah's eternal kingship (Gen. 49,10; PssSol 17,4) will be fulfilled in the one who is to come. Here the salvation of Israel is especially connected with a king from Judah. We may compare T.N. 8,2 which commands unity with Levi and Judah, but connects the expression *ἀνατελεῖ σωτηρία* with Judah alone. Again a personal saviour is meant, Jesus Christ, as v. 3 shows. He will not only save Israel but will also "gather together the righteous from among the Gentiles".

Three other passages mention Judah before Levi. In T.D. 5,10a the phrase "and there will arise unto you from the tribe of Judah and Levi the salvation of the Lord" serves as a transition between the Return element in v. 9 and the "Saviour"-passage that follows in vv. 10b-13 (see also sections 3 and 5). Although *σωτήριον* is used, clearly a personal saviour is meant. T.G. 8,1 also mentions Judah before Levi, uses *ἀνατελεῖ* as a transitive verb with "the Lord" as subject and *σωτήρα* as object. The Saviour for Israel is connected with the two tribes. The last passage to be mentioned is T.Jos. 19,6. Judah is again mentioned before Levi, the subject of *ἀνατελεῖ*

is ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ "by grace saving all the Gentiles and Israel. He will be a king for ever" (v. 7)²¹).

All passages mentioned in this section refer to the coming of Jesus Christ, explicitly or implicitly. Sometimes he is connected with the two tribes, sometimes he is particularly or exclusively related to Judah; a few times Judah is mentioned before Levi. In all instances the author is concerned with the salvation of Israel *and* that of those outside Israel. Twice the Gentiles are even mentioned before Israel. Notwithstanding the variety in this group of passages there is a reasonable degree of consistency in their view on the salvation of Israel.

5. *A difficult passage: T.D. 5,10-6,10*

The chapters 5 and 6 of the Testament of Dan consist of direct exhortations (5,1-3; 6,1-2a. 8-9a. 10a(11)) closely connected with predictions concerning the future which present many difficulties with regard to form and content. 5,4-9 is basically a S.E.R. passage, interspersed with L.J. elements in v. 4 and vv. 6-7. As we have already noticed, a J.L. element follows as introduction of a "Saviour"-passage (vv. 10-13). Alternatively, one may speak of a J.L. passage expanded to a "Saviour"-passage. In chapter 6 none of the standard patterns is used. The situation in chapter 5 as well as that of chapter 6 reminds us of the fact that the "patterns", "forms" which we try to distinguish and to analyse are there to be used (or not) and to be varied by authors. They may also be repeated and combined, or fragmented; in any case they will be applied when and where the author feels that they are apposite. The same is true of traditional elements and motifs like those found in the "Saviour" and Resurrection passages. Modern readers will feel confused and they will be inclined to create order by means of

²¹) In passing we may mention here T.R. 6,5-8, 10-12, two connected passages which, like T.S. 5,4-6, focus on Levi and mention Judah only as a very secondary figure. In the first passage, Levi's priesthood is glorified; it will, however, only last "until the consummation of times (the times) of the anointed highpriest, of whom the Lord spoke" (cf. T.L. 8,14; 18,1). In the second passage v. 11b takes up the theme of Levi's kingship "over all the nations". It is followed in v. 12 by a reference to Levi's seed that must be worshipped "because it (he) will die for us in visible and invisible wars and will be among you king for ever". Whereas Levi's priestly activity ends when "the anointed highpriest" Jesus Christ comes, his kingship will be realized, for ever, in that of his "seed" Jesus Christ.

literary criticism or with the help of hypotheses concerning stages of redaction. We may well ask, however, whether modern standards of consistency can ever be applied to the texts under discussion with any chance of success. The use of different sources, various fixed traditional complexes and the existence of different stages in a prolonged process of editing cannot be denied. The question is, to what extent earlier strata can still be reconstructed and, above all, whether our reconstruction really helps us to understand the coherence in or underneath the present text and to detect the really decisive elements in the complex structures we have to analyse²²).

If we now turn to T.D. 5,10-6,10 for a moment, we find that the second half of 5,10 and v. 11 tell us that the saviour (implicitly announced in the previous clause, which connects "the salvation of the Lord" with Levi and Judah) will make war against Beliar, will free the souls of the holy ones and will give peace to those who call upon the Lord. The theme of Beliar's defeat is familiar in the Testaments (cf. T.S. 6,6; T.L. 3,3; 18,12; T.Jud. 25,3; T.Z. 9,8); it follows here after v. 1b which exhorts the sons of Dan to follow the commandments of the Lord "...in order that the Lord may dwell in you and Beliar may flee from you" and the statement of the patriarch in v. 6 that Satan is the ruler of his sons. Notwithstanding the announcement that the saviour "will give a victorious vengeance to our fathers" the general outlook is universalist. All "who call upon the Lord" (cf. 6,3 and T.Jud. 24,6) will receive peace. Holy ones will rest in Eden and righteous ones will rejoice over the new Jerusalem. In v. 13 the author's thought turns again to Israel: Jerusalem will no longer endure desolation and Israel will no longer be led captive, for the Lord will be in the midst of it (= Jerusalem). From the details which are given ("living together with men"; "reigning over them in humility and poverty") it is clear that Jesus Christ is meant. V. 13 end adds: "He who believes in him will reign in heaven."

Chapter 6 continues with a general exhortation to fear the Lord and to beware of Satan and his spirits (v. 1). The battle with the forces of evil is still going on. The sons of Dan must draw near to God and to the angel who intercedes for them. This angel, called

²²) See M. E. STONE's important article "Coherence and Inconsistency in the Apocalypses: The Case of 'the End' in 4 Ezra", *JBL* 102 (1983), pp. 229-243.

“mediator of God and men”²³), is the protagonist in the battle against the kingdom of the Enemy who tries to destroy all who call upon the Lord (vv. 2-3). Yet the angel is concerned with the peace of Israel (v. 2) and the Enemy knows that the moment Israel will believe his kingdom will come to an end (v. 4). The next verse assures that the angel (now called “the angel of peace”²⁴) will strengthen Israel so as to prevent its falling into the extremity of evil.

The general picture is clear and consistent: a worldwide struggle is in progress between God and his angel on the one hand and the Enemy on the other. Israel has received a special position, the sons of Dan, who have to be particularly careful, are warned to stick to God and to beware of the devil. The final victory, announced in 5,10-13, is not yet reality. Moreover, the Testaments know of a period in which Israel will behave lawlessly. The Lord will leave them and go to the Gentiles who do his will. Yet his name remains Saviour “in every place of Israel and the Gentiles” (vv. 6-7). Though he may have left Israel, he is still a saviour for them. Therefore the patriarch repeats his exhortations and urges his children to hand them down to future generations (vv. 8-9a). If his descendants are obedient, the “saviour of the Gentiles” will receive them “for he is true and longsuffering, meek and lowly, and teaching the law of God through his works” (v. 9b). If the sons adhere to God’s law Dan’s “race will be saved for ever”.

Israel occupies a special place in God’s dealings with mankind, and Israel has a special responsibility. It will refuse to accept Jesus Christ, but even after this refusal there is hope, if they fear the Lord and love their neighbour, i.e. obey God’s essential commandments. The sons of Dan who are in the sphere of influence of the Enemy present an exceptionally hard case—yet also for them there will be salvation “for ever”.

6. *Conclusions*

We are now in a position to draw some general conclusions:

a. It makes sense to concentrate on the present Christian text of the Testaments, and to look for the really decisive elements in their

²³) Cf. T.L. 5,6 ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ παραιτούμενος τὸ γένος Ἰσραὴλ to which 5,7 adds ... καὶ πάντων τῶν δικαίων.

²⁴) Cf. T.A. 6,4.6 and T.B. 6,1.

complex descriptions of God's final judgment and salvation. In this we have to keep in mind the points made in the introduction to section 5.

b. In the descriptions of future events in the Testaments certain "patterns" are found frequently (L.J. and S.E.R.); the same is, *mutatis mutandis*, true of combinations of traditional motifs as found in the Resurrection and "Saviour"-passages. There is a great variety in the application of these "patterns" and the combinations of traditional motifs. In the distribution of the various types of passages over the various testaments and their combinations (in cases: the combination of standard elements only) no system can be detected. Yet the final result reveals a coherent approach to the question under discussion in this article.

c. In all passages reviewed Israel's special position receives emphasis. The exhortations directed to the sons of Jacob and concentrating on the abiding elements in God's law are important in all stages of Israel's history, also in the time between God's arrival on earth in the person of Jesus Christ, "the renewer of the Law", and the final judgment. Exhortations, predictions of sins and warnings are closely connected; they are repeated with a certain insistence and have an urgent character.

d. The priestly leaders of Israel are singled out for their rejection of Jesus Christ. In other passages Israel's (collective) refusal receives attention. Yet all along there is a great concern for Israel's final salvation, and the definite promise that Israel will share in God's salvation if it obeys God's commandments and/or believes in Jesus Christ. Also for the sons of Levi there is compassion, and even the sons of Dan, beset by evil spirits, may hope for salvation "for ever". T.B. 10,11, which occupies a crucial position in the Testaments, leaves no doubt: "But you, if you walk in holiness before the face of the Lord, you will again dwell safely with me, and all Israel will be gathered together unto the Lord".

e. There are good reasons to date the Testaments in the second half of the second century, the time in which Christians took over the Jewish Scriptures as their "Old Testament"²⁵). The Testaments use the authority of the sons of Jacob to convince their readers that Israel will be saved if it really obeys God's

²⁵) See also my articles mentioned in notes 6 and 8.

commandments—as interpreted by Christians after the example of Jesus Christ—seriously and if they turn to the saviour of Israel and the Gentiles. We do not know whether the Testaments directly aimed at Jewish readers. We know next to nothing about situations in the early Church in which such a “missionary” tractate could be expected to be effective. Yet, the Christian circles which are responsible for the Testaments were clearly genuinely concerned with the salvation of the Jews; they too, no doubt, were guided by the ideas expressed in this writing in their thinking about and their contacts with their Jewish brethren²⁶).

²⁶) J. JERVELL, in his article mentioned in n. 3, was the first to show that in many passages of the Testaments the salvation for the nations is regarded as self-evident, whereas the position of Israel presents a problem. In my article “The Main Issues” (see n. 6) I noted a number of points of disagreement with JERVELL’s approach, but suggested that his discovery would prove of great importance for the solution of the problem of the origin of the Testaments (pp. 523f). The present article and the one on the parallels between the Testaments and Justin and Irenaeus (see n. 8) use a different approach and come to different results (JERVELL, for instance, dates the main Christian interpolations at the end of the first century). But because JERVELL takes the interpolated Testaments seriously as part of early Christian literature, there are, nevertheless, a considerable number of points at which his exegesis agrees with mine.

LEVI, THE SONS OF LEVI AND THE LAW,
IN *TESTAMENT LEVI* X, XIV-XV and XVI

1. Introduction

The study of the *Testament of Levi*, the third testament in the *Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs*, is beset with many difficulties. Its contents differ considerably from that of the other testaments; the author responsible for the composition of the twelve testaments clearly had special Levi-material at his disposition. This is borne out by the clear parallels existing between various passages in *T. Levi* and in the Aramaic Levi-fragments found in the Cairo Genizah and at Qumran, as well as in related large additions in the Greek MS *e* at *T.L.* 2,3 and 18,2¹.

At first sight, the presence of these parallels would suggest that it would be relatively easy to reconstruct the pre-history of *T. Levi*, but on closer inspection the existing fragments raise more questions than they solve. Where they are extant the complexity in the structure of the Greek testament is only brought out more clearly², and where there are no or only very small fragments, as in the case of the chapters under discussion, the situation is equally complicated.

J.T. Milik has given an ingenious reconstruction of the fragment 4 Q Test Levi^a 8 iii and has argued: « The context of the column mentioned is that of chapter 14 of the Greek Testament of Levi, but with phrases which are encountered again in ch. 15 and 16; all this part of the testament contains invectives against the Israelite priesthood »³. This fragment shows that the Aramaic Levi-apocryphon to which, in all probability, all Aramaic (and Greek) fragments go back ultimately, did not only contain descriptions of Levi's investiture as priest but also an announcement of future sins of the sons of Levi. But why are there so many repetitions between ch. 10, ch. 14-15 and ch. 16, which are all built according to the same pattern? We have to reckon with the possibility that the present *T. Levi*, while showing many parallels with the supposed apocryphon, is not derived directly from that document in its Aramaic or its Greek form. There may have been many intermediary stages and, in any case, the present text of *T. Levi* as part of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is the result of thorough redaction⁴.

Scholars have tried to explain the complexity of this Testament and of *T XII Patr* in general, by means of various critical methods, notably with the help of textual, literary, tradition and redaction criticism. In a recent article I discussed briefly the approaches of R.H. Charles⁵, J. Bekker⁶ and A. Hultgård⁷ and arrived at the conclusion:

« Their attempts to explain the differences within the Testaments by means of a reconstruction of the genesis of the present text have led to widely divergent results. The search for the historical circumstances reflected in the text, and for the group(s) responsible for the Testaments is apparently doomed to failure for lack of really clear convincing evidence... It is not a priori likely that modern scholarly standards of consistency can be applied to a document like the Testaments. It is equally unlikely that at the final stage of redaction sufficient editorial elements of previous stages were left to enable us to give a clear picture of those earlier redactions. In fact, it is not at all clear that the variety within the Testaments can only be explained by the theory of multiple redaction. To trace the use of sources and traditional material with the help of external parallels is one thing, to reconstruct different stages of redaction by means of internal literary criticism quite another⁸... »

It is not unfair to say that ever since scholars started to explain *T XII Patr* as a heavily interpolated and redacted text⁹, the final result of this complicated process, i.e., the text as it stands has not received sufficient attention. Moreover, text-critical arguments have been used in entirely unacceptable ways to fortify the opinion of the various scholars with regard to the supposed « original » text of particular passages¹⁰. Any attempt at interpretation will have to start from the text as we have it, i.e., as we can reconstruct it in its earliest accessible form with the methods of textual criticism. It is a text handed down by Christians, showing a number of patently Christian passages which should not be eliminated a priori. In his edition of the Testaments of 1908¹¹, R.H. Charles did not only give an eclectic text with a very personal textual commentary, but he also used square brackets to indicate those passages which, in his view, were interpolated — in the great majority of cases by a Christian. The other commentators mentioned above have often disagreed with Charles in their results but not in method. Their comments, too, deal with the supposed pre-Christian document at various stages of its making, rather than with the Testaments as we know them.

In this paper I shall comment on the present text of *T. Levi* 10;14—15; 16, as it has been reconstructed in the Leiden edition of 1978¹² and approach it with the expectation that this text is meant to convey a meaning notwithstanding its complicated history. For reasons of space I shall limit my discussions with earlier commentators to a minimum.

2. The chapters 10; 14—15 and 16, as Sin-Exile-Return passages

In my dissertation of 1953, I distinguished two regularly recurring « patterns » in the passages dealing with the future and spoke of Sin-Exile-Return-passages and Levi-Juda passages ¹³. One glance at the chapters discussed in this paper shows that they speak about the sins of the sons of the patriarch in some detail, announce the coming punishment of which dispersion among the nations is a prominent feature, and of the future return. The author of the *Testaments* repeats the S and E elements three times — in the case of ch. 14—15 he even adds an initial announcement of sin and punishment in 14,1[2], before going into more detail. The R element, however, is only fully developed at the end of the third passage (16,5). In 14,5 the author refers to « the book of Enoch the righteous », for the Lord's election of Jerusalem as the House of the Lord; this is a comment on v. 3 where city and temple are mentioned for the first time (see also 15,1 and *T.Zeb.* 9,8). In 15,4, we hear that nobody of Levi's seed would be left upon the earth if not because of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, a statement clearly pointing forward to the end of another SER passage *T.Asher* 7,7: « the Lord will gather you together in faith through the expectation of his tender mercy, because of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob ¹⁴ ». In 16,5, the three passages come to a common end; God's visitation is announced: « In pity He will receive you through faith and water ». The threefold repetition is clearly meant to emphasize the future sins and the punishment that will follow; the last word, however, is a reference to God's mercy.

Only in *T.Levi* we find a combination of three SER passages. Two connected passages are found in *T.Naphi.* 4,1-3 and vv. 4-6, and *T.Asher* 7,2-4 and vv. 5-7. In both cases there is not simply repetition, but an attempt to create a meaningful whole under the aspect of « l'histoire se répète ». Similarly the SER passage *T.Zeb.* 9,5-7 and v. 8 which emphasizes the Lord's salvation are followed by v. 9 announcing new sins against the Lord and new punishment « unto the time of consummation ». Of the other SER passages I only mention *T.Dan* 5,6-9 (preceded and followed by a LJ passage!) where the patriarch announces that his sons will commit their sins together with the sons of Levi and Judah — although in 5,4 Levi and Judah are said to be led by an angel, and to be the mainstay of Israel. The sins of the sons of Levi and the sons of Judah (also described in *T.Jud.* 23) seem to be of particular importance for the author of the *Testaments*.

These parallel passages cannot be discussed in detail here: I have dealt with them briefly elsewhere ¹⁵, emphasizing that in all these cases we cannot simply speak of later additions to or adaptations of so-called « original » texts. Though not constructed according to our standards of consistency, and often betraying the use of older material, the passages as we have them before us want to convey a meaning, and it is this meaning we are asked to discover.

3. Chapters 14—15

This SE(R) passage begins with a reference to the writings of Enoch, like the next one (16,1, cf. 10,5) and a number of other SER passages. J.T. Milik reads Enoch's name in the 4 Q fragment which provides a parallel to v. 3, and thinks that there the *Book of the Watchers* is referred to. However that may be, the references to Enoch in the Testaments are of a more general nature. Enoch is the ancient authority to whom God revealed his secrets. So 16,1 connects a concept found in Daniel (see Dan 9,24-27)¹⁶ with this ancient worthy, and similarly he is the authority for God's election of Jerusalem and the temple, notwithstanding the deuteronomic phraseology which is used (Deut 12,5.11.14.21.26 and often!; cf. 1 Kings 8,16f and 2 Chr 6,5f¹⁷).

In v. 1 the general announcement of *asebeia* against the Lord is followed by the specification *kheiras epiballontes en pasēi kakiai*. It is not clear whether *en pasēi kakiai* is the object of *epiballein* (an unusual construction) or whether *ep' auton* (sc. *kyrion*) should be added¹⁸. The author of the present testament gives his exegesis in v. 2: the *asebeia* mentioned is that of the highpriests who will lay their hands upon the saviour of the world. V. 2 is a clear Christian comment on a (even in present form) not specifically Christian «Vorlage»¹⁹.

Vv. 3-4 compare the sons of Levi with the lights of heaven, the sun and the moon. Their light is the light of the Law, which was given to them to enlighten every man. There is a clear parallel with Levi himself of whom the angel says: «You will light up the brilliant light of knowledge in Israel, and you will be as the sun for all the seed of Israel» (4,3). We may also point to 18,3f., where the star of the new priest to come is said to rise in heaven as that of a king, «lighting up the light of knowledge as through the sun during the day. He (the new priest) will shine as the sun on the earth and will remove all darkness from under heaven...». 18,9 emphasizes that «during his priesthood the nations will be multiplied in knowledge on the earth and enlightened through the grace of the Lord» in contrast with Israel «that will be diminished in ignorance and darkened through sorrow». Like their father the sons of Levi have been appointed to spread God's light in the world. If they fail to do so and are darkened *en asebeiai*, the nations will be at a loss; they will have to wait for a new priest to be sent, after the old priesthood, punished by God, has come to an end (18,1f).

Now the expression «light of the Law» (cf. also 19,1!) is often found in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha as S. Aalen has shown²⁰. For the connection between priests and the spreading of light we may point to Sir 45,17 (cf. 50,6f), Jub 31,14f, 1 Q Sb IV,27, perhaps also 4 Q pIsa^a 4f²¹ and now also the new fragment 4 Q TestLevi^a 8 iii. In these texts spreading light is connected with granting knowledge and teaching God's ordinances just as in *T.L.* 4,2-6; 14,4; 18,2-3.9. One of the main tasks of the

priests is to teach and to judge according to the Law — so also *T.L.* 8,2 ; 13, and *T.Rub* 6,8, and vv. 8 and 18 in the *Prayer of Levi* ²² and vv. 80-90 of the Aramaic Genizah fragments. Among the transgressions mentioned in the list of priestly sins found in *T.L.* 14,5-8, we find, therefore, *en pleonexias entolas Kyriou didaxete*.

The author of the present testament may have followed his « Vorlage » very closely. The catalogue of sins found in 14,5-8 is far more elaborate than in the other SER passages but that does not militate against its belonging to the « Vorlage » ²³. The sins are described in general terms and it is impossible to connect this passage with any specific period in the history of Israel. The announcement of the punishment in 15,1-3 does not call for specific comment and v. 4 has already been discussed in section 2 above. There are only two passages where Christian influence can be traced with certainty. One is v. 2 already mentioned, the second is found at the end of v. 4 : *touton thelontes anelein, enantias entolas didaskontes tois tou theou dikaiōmasi*. The second of these clauses is entirely in keeping with the first clause in v. 6 just referred to, but the two participles produce an *anakolouthon* and, particularly, the masculine pronoun *touton* (pointing back to *to phoos tou nomou!*) betrays that the two phrases together form a Christian comment, comparable to that in v. 2 ²⁴.

Unfortunately, the mutilated fragment published by Milik does not tell us who will be the recipients of the light of the Law. Milik's addition in lines 5-6 « what will all [the] [peoples do] » is a conjecture on the basis of *T.Levi* 14,4. The problem of the relation between Israel and the Gentiles in the *Testaments* is a very complicated one and cannot be discussed here. Yet it may be good to note that the preceding « wisdom »-chapter *T.L.* 13 — which shows many points of agreement (if not in actual wording then, at any rate, in ideas) with vv. 84-95 of the Aramaic fragments — emphasizes the influence in all circles of the wise man who learns and teaches the Law ²⁵. Joseph is mentioned as a glorious example. It is quite possible that also the « Vorlage » of *T.L.* 14 spoke about the light of the Law for the world at large. When, however, the *Testaments* speak about the new priest of the future « to whom all words of the Lord will be revealed » and who will judge righteously on the earth (18,2), the knowledge which he receives and grants is no longer directly connected with the Law of Israel. Amongst the many indications of Christian influence in this chapter ²⁶ one is the express mention of Israel's ignorance and darkness in v. 9 over against the full knowledge and enlightenment of the Gentiles. The expression *phōtizōn phōs gnōseōs* used in 4,3 and 18,3 recurs, in a slightly different form, towards the end of the *Testaments*. In *T.Benj.* 11,2 it is connected with the activity of Paul of whom it is said : « enlightening with new knowledge all the Gentiles, as a light of knowledge bursting in on Israel for salvation... ».

The Christian influence, very modest in *T.L.* 14—15, is dominant in *T.L.* 18 and in *T.Benj.* 11, and so much so that it is impossible to reconstruct

a non-Christian « Vorlage ». The same is true of *T.L.* 10 and *T.L.* 16, as will now be argued in more detail.

4. Chapter 10

Even if we did not have the Aramaic Levi-fragments at our disposal, we would note the strange position of *T.L.* 10. Isaac's instructions to Levi concerning « the law of the priesthood » (v. 7) suddenly end at v. 14, to be followed by instructions of Levi to his sons. If we compare chapter 9 with the Aramaic fragments we note that vv. 7-14 have a parallel in a much longer list of instructions found in the Aramaic and Greek fragments (vv. 14-61) — a list that is immediately followed by a text which runs parallel to chapters 11—12 (from v. 62 onwards). So *T.L.* 10, in all probability, is not modelled on earlier Levi-material. Many commentators regard this chapter as a later addition to an original form of the Testaments, and J. Becker²⁷ in particular, argues against the hypothesis found in my dissertation that the author of the Testaments inserted this chapter between chapters 9 and 11 because he had omitted so much of Isaac's instructions²⁸. Why, Becker asks, would this man consciously create doublets and insert one of them in a thematically completely different context? The same question, however, could be asked in the case of a secondary addition²⁹. If the author of the present *Testaments* wanted to emphasize the future sins of the sons of Levi and their punishment through deliberate repetition (see section 2 above), we can understand that he attached one of these announcements to Isaac's instructions to Levi. In chapter 9 itself, when giving a warning against the spirit of fornication (compare v. 9a and 10 with fragm. vv. 16 and 17), he inserts a prediction of pollution of the holy place (or : the holy things) by this spirit through Levi's offspring — thereby introducing the theme of Chapter 10.

In *T.Levi* 10,2, the *asebeia* of the sons of Levi consists in the transgression *hēn poiēsete epi synteileiai tōn aiōnōn eis ton sōtēra tou kosmou* (so also 14,2 ; cf. *T.Dan* 6,7.9 ; *T.Benj.* 3,8). In this way they will lead Israel astray and will bring great evil upon it from the Lord. Jerusalem will not bear them because of their wickedness ; it will rend the veil of the temple, portrayed as a garment, and thereby no longer cover their shame. The conception of the temple-veil as a garment which is rent at Jesus' death is found in a number of variations in early Christian literature ; here we have a special variant influenced by *Hos* 2,11f (LXX) ; *Lam* 1,8 and *Ez* 23,10.29. The sins of Israel (in our case : the sons of Levi and Israel) are uncovered ; everybody is now able to see how unfaithful God's partner has been³⁰.

J. Becker assumes a thorough Christian redaction of a Jewish « Grundstock »³¹ ; in his translation³², however, he brackets only *epi ton sōtēra tou kosmou* and v. 3, from *alla schisai* onwards, as interpolations. D. Haupt³³ brackets *hēn poiēsete... kosmou* in v. 2 and the entire v. 3.

Hultgård ³⁴, wrongly assessing the parallels mentioned on p. 123f of my dissertation, only brackets the phrase *epi ton sōtēra tou kosmou*. All three scholars assume some Jewish original whereas the only thing we can say with certainty is that the author was aware of the existence of the SER pattern in the Old Testament and Jewish literature, including the Levi-material which he also used in *T.L.* 14—15.

The declaration of innocence in v. 2a : *athōios eimi apo...*, to which may be compared the expression *kai gar ho patēr hēmōn Israēl katharos estai apo...* in 14,2, is not a regular element in the introduction of the SER passages. It agrees with *T.L.* 4,2-6 which makes a clear separation between the blessing given to Levi, and his offspring (vv. 2-4a), and the great sins which the sons of Levi will commit against the son of God (v. 4b) although Levi has warned them beforehand (v. 5). At the final consummation Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and Levi and all the saints will rejoice greatly (18,14). The patriarchs (i.e. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the twelve sons of Jacob) will share in the resurrection at the end of days, so *T.Jud.* 25 tells us; in *T.Zeb.* 10,2 the patriarch assures his sons : « I shall rise again as a leader amongst my sons, and I shall rejoice in the midst of my tribe as many as have kept the Law of the Lord and the commandments of Zebulun their father ». *T.Benj.* 10,6-10 speaks of the resurrection of Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob together with all the sons of Jacob who will rule, each over his own tribe, « worshipping the king of heaven who appeared on earth in the form of a humble man. And as many as believed in Him on earth will rejoice with Him. »

In *T.L.* 4,4 ; 10,2 ; 14,2(3) ; 16,3, as well as in *T.Zeb.* 9,8f ; *T.Asher* 7,3-5, the sins predicted for the future are clearly the sins committed against Jesus Christ. The patriarch has exhorted his sons to obey God and to teach the Law, predicted them what would happen and warned them (see also *T.Asher* 7,4 !). With his brothers he will share in the joy of the future resurrection with all those who obey the Lord among the Gentiles and with those among their sons who, in the end, turn to God and accept his mercy ³⁵.

5. Chapter 16

In 16,1-3 we find a « normal » SER passage notwithstanding the introduction concerning Enoch's prediction on the seventy weeks ³⁶. V. 2a deals with the contempt for « law and prophets » ³⁷ ; v. 2b, with the persecution of righteous men, among them « a man who renews the Law in the power of the Most High » whom they will call a deceiver ; « and at last, you will kill him, as you think, because you do not know his majesty (rehabilitation ? ³⁸) taking innocent blood through wickedness upon your heads » (v. 3). V. 3 is clearly Christian ³⁹ ; clearly a climax is reached : the sons of Levi who are responsible for the teaching of the Law kill a man sent by God to renew the Law ! V. 4 directly connects the destruction of

the holy place with the sins against Jesus: *di'auton* is to be preferred to *dia touto* as *lectio difficilior*⁴⁰. After a reference to curse and dispersion among the Gentiles we finally find a complete R element; it does not come as a surprise that it is clearly Christian: « until He will visit you and receive you in pity through faith and water » (v. 5; cf. *T.Asher* 7,[3].7).

Again, most scholars posit a Jewish « Vorlage » though their is no real proof for its existence. Again, the most likely conclusion is that the author of the Testaments deliberately composed a third SER passage, ending this time with a clear reference to the final salvation for all those who put their trust in God's mercy and who accept baptism.

6. Conclusions

From these few chapters in a single testament no general conclusions can be drawn with regard to the composition of the Testaments as a whole. Moreover *Test.Levi* is already different from other testaments, because the author had many Levi-traditions, probably even a complete document, at his disposal. And our analysis of this testament differs from that of the others, because we are able to compare the text before us with the Levi-material, however fragmentary this may be at places, and how different the actual « Vorlage » of the testament may have been from the Aramaic and Greek fragments at our disposal.

In chapters 14—15, the author, in all likelihood, remained close to his « Vorlage ». In chapters 10 and 16 the SER pattern is deliberately repeated and here the obvious Christian elements form a much more integrated part of the text. Deliberate repetition is not only found in these chapters and in other SER passages summed up in section 2, but also earlier in *T.Levi*. In the first vision the investiture of Levi described in 5,2 is announced twice by the accompanying angel, in 2,9-12 and in 4,2-6. The first vision is followed by a second one in chapter 8 (clearly meant as a corroboration of the first, see vv. 18f). In this highly complicated chapter we find, again, two descriptions of Levi's investiture by seven angels.

It seems clear that repetition does not point to later addition, but is a deliberate redactional device used to stress the things that really matter. In the SER passages outside *T.Levi* the « l'histoire se répète » — motif effectively illustrates the attitude of the sons of Israel in general, and against Jesus in particular. In the S-element in the three SER passages in *T.Levi*, as well as in 4,2-6, there is a strong emphasis on the negative reaction of the sons of Levi against Jesus Christ. The sons do not follow in the steps of the father, and do not give heed to his warnings; notwithstanding their firm commitment in 19,1-3⁴¹, they will not be faithful in the teaching and administration of the Law. In the end they will kill, as they think, the renewer of the Law who is authorised by God, taking his innocent blood upon their heads (16,3). They are cursed (4,6); according to 18,9, Israel, in contrast with the Gentiles, will remain in darkness. Yet

15,4 and 16,5 show that the sons of Levi are not excluded from God's salvation for the Gentiles and Israel.

We have already noted that the knowledge given to the new priest of chapter 18 and bestowed by him is not connected with the Law. We should now add that this figure himself is not said to stem from Levi. Becker has argued that we must be very cautious with an *argumentum e silentio*⁴². If, however, we contrast *T. Levi* 18,1f with the announcement of the future king from Judah in *T. Judah* 24,1 (cf. 22,2f), and compare it with *T. Levi* 8,14 which speaks about a new priesthood, after the fashion of the Gentiles, for the Gentiles instituted by a king from Judah, we cannot but regard the silence in *T.L.* 18 with regard to the descendance of the New Priest from Levi as significant. In corroboration we may point to the limitation of Levi's priestly activity to a certain period in the earlier chapters: *until* the coming of the son of God in 4,4, *until* God's coming to dwell in the midst of Israel 5,2⁴³; Levi will proclaim concerning the one who will redeem Israel 2,10, and according to 2,11 this will be the Lord who appears among men through Levi and Judah⁴⁴.

Levi is glorified as the priest par excellence. He is God's supreme servant, and although his sons fail badly, there is no doubt about his living in complete obedience to God and his Law⁴⁵. But the New Priest to come will surpass him — Levi knows this and in the end of days he will rejoice in the new Saviour of the world, together with the other sons of Jacob.

¹ The Genizah fragments and the Greek texts in MS *e* can be found in *Appendix III* of R.H. CHARLES, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford 1908; the Qumran fragments were partly published by J.T. Milik in various publications summed up in part II,1 of my article «The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and essential Viewpoints», to be published in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II/20. Earlier discussions by the present author of the problems of *T. Levi* can be found in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Their Text, Composition and Origin*, Assen 1953 (²1975), pp. 38-52; «Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs», originally in *NovTest* (1960), pp. 182-235, now in M. DE JONGE (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (StVTPs 3), Leiden 1975, pp. 193-246, particularly pp. 210-235; «Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII», originally in *Travels in the World of the Old Testament* (Festschrift M.A. Beek), Assen 1974, pp. 132-145, now in *Studies on the Testaments*, pp. 247-260.

² See e.g. my «Notes on the Testament of Levi II-VII», mentioned in the previous note.

³ See his *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Cave 4*, Oxford 1976, pp. 23-24.

⁴ See the parts II.4 and III.1-5 of the ANRW-article mentioned in note 1, and my paper for the S.N.T.S. conference Durham, August 1979: «The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs», *NTS* 26 (1979-80), pp. 508-524 (cf. pp. 515-521).

⁵ *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, translated from the editor's Greek text, London 1908.

⁶ *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (AGJU 8), Leiden 1970.

⁷ *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* (Acta Univ. Upsaliensis, Hist. Rel. 6), Uppsala 1977. The approach of D. HAUPT, in his *Das Testament des Levi. Untersuchungen zu seiner Entstehung und Überlieferungsgeschichte* (Diss. Halle 1969) is not significantly different.

⁸ Cf. my ANRW-article (note 1) IV, 2.

⁹ That is since F. SCHNAPP, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*, Halle 1884 (see the survey of recent criticism in J. BECKER, *op. cit.*, pp. 129-158).

¹⁰ See in particular my « Textual criticism and the analysis of the composition of the Testament of Zebulun », in *Studies on the Testaments*, pp. 120-139.

¹¹ For the title, see note 1.

¹² M. DE JONGE in cooperation with H.W. HOLLANDER, H.J. DE JONGE and Th. KORTEWEG, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PsVTGr 1/2), Leiden 1978.

¹³ *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, pp. 83-89; compare ANRW-article, III.5. On the SER pattern see J. BECKER, *op. cit.*, pp. 172-182; D. HAUPT, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-104; A. HULTGÅRD, *op. cit.*, pp. 82-267, and, particularly, O.H. STECK, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten* (WMANT 23), Neukirchen 1967, pp. 149-153.

¹⁴ Compare also *T. Levi* 18,14 (and Ex 2,24).

¹⁵ See ANRW-article, III.5.

¹⁶ Neither the seventy shepherds in 1 En 89,59, nor the *Apocalypse of weeks* in 1 En 93-91,12-17, provide a good parallel. There are no Aramaic fragments corresponding to chapters 16-17 extant, according to J.T. MILIK, *op. cit.*, pp. 252f. Nevertheless Milik assumes that the original text contained a fairly detailed description of the seventy weeks as well as an *Apocalypse of Jubilees* (corresponding to ch. 17). As Milik dates the Aramaic Levi in the third century B.C., it preceded the Book of Daniel!

¹⁷ In *T. Zeb* 3,4 the custom of the taking off of the sandal in connection with the refusal of levirate marriage (Deut 25,5-10) is said to be written in the law of Enoch (the variant « of Moses » in MSS *c h i j* is clearly *lectio facilior*). On these references to Enoch see further my *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, p. 84.

¹⁸ These words are, in fact, found in MSS *c h i j* as an obviously secondary addition.

¹⁹ On the phrase: « But our father Israel will be pure from the transgression of the highpriests », see the comments on 10,2, in section 4 below.

²⁰ *Die Begriffe « Licht » und « Finsternis » im Alten Testament, im Spätjudentum und im Rabbinismus* (Skrifter Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II: Hist. Fil. Klasse, 1951,1), Oslo 1951, pp. 183-195. A. HULTGÅRD, *op. cit.*, p. 282, n. 2, adds: *PsPhilo, Ant. Bibl.* 11,1; 12,2; 15,6 (see also 23,10).

²¹ See J. MAIER, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, II, München/Basel 1960, p. 161, note on 1 Q Sb iv,27. Compare also *Test. Job* 31,5.

²² See the Levi-fragment published by J.T. Milik in *RB* 62 (1955), pp. 398-406, and the more complete parallel Greek text found in MS *e* at *T.L.* 2,3.

²³ Against HAUPT, *op. cit.*, pp. 95ff, who remarks: « 14,2-8 lassen sich mühelos aus dem Kontext lösen ».

²⁴ It is possible that v. 4b is a marginal gloss added at a later time. Note also the variant to *phōs tou kosmou* in *b k i* (cf. *l d*) connecting this verse with John 1,9.

²⁵ The fragments speak here about wisdom. See also pp. 80-83 (with notes!) in H.W. HOLLANDER, « The Ethical Character of the Patriarch Joseph », in G. NICKELSBURG JR, *Studies on the Testament of Joseph* (S.B.L. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 5), Missoula 1975, pp. 47-104.

²⁶ This has (again) been denied, lately, by A. HULTGÅRD, *op. cit.*, pp. 268-290, who, after some dubious (mainly text-) critical operations, declares that the remaining text is a carefully composed whole belonging to the last stage of the origin of the Testaments. In his exegesis H. deals with a number of expressions individually, and once he has shown they need not necessarily to be Christian he concludes that they are not, neither individually nor collectively. With this atomizing exegesis one is able to prove almost everything.

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 93.

²⁸ *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, pp. 40-42. On p. 42, I wrongly called chapter 10 « a redacted and abbreviated version of ch. 14-15 ».

²⁹ HAUPT, *op. cit.*, p. 101, remarks: « Offen muss bleiben, ob dieser Abschnitt zunächst in seinem jüdischen Grundbestand oder bereits in seiner christlichen Form eingefügt wurde. »

³⁰ See my *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, pp. 123f. and « Het motief van

het gescheurde voorhangsel van de tempel in een aantal vroegchristelijke geschriften », *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 21 (1966-67), pp. 257-276. Unfortunately, this article, written in Dutch, does not seem to have attracted the attention of scholars.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 280-282.

³² *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*, in JSHRZ III/1, p. 54 (see also his notes).

³³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 100f.

³⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 93-96.

³⁵ On the problem of the salvation for the Gentiles and Israel see the important article by J. JERVELL, « Ein Interpolator interpretiert. Zu der christlichen Bearbeitung der Testaments der Zwölf Patriarchen », in C. BURCHARD-J. JERVELL-Joh. THOMAS, *Studien zu den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen* (BZNW 36), Berlin 1969, pp. 30-61, and my ANRW-article, IV, 3. A. HULTGÅRD, « L'Universalisme des Test. XII Patr. » in *Ex orbe religionum: Studia Geo Widengren oblata*, t. 1 (Numen, Suppl. 21), Leiden 1972, pp. 192-207, is unsatisfactory.

³⁶ On v. 1, see on p. 520, below.

³⁷ Clearly the books of the prophets are meant: see O.H. STECK, *op. cit.*, p. 152, n. 6.

³⁸ *Anasiema* means « height », « majesty » (L.Sc.J., s.v.); J. BECKER, in his note on this verse in his translation mentioned in note 32, refers to Judith 12,8: Judith asks God *kateuthynai tēn hodon autēs eis anasiema tōn huiōn tou laou autou*; cf. the meaning « restoration » given in G.W.H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v.

³⁹ HAUPT, *op. cit.*, pp. 104f, assumes that the verse in its original form referred to Onias III (cf. Dan 9,26f). HULTGÅRD, *op. cit.*, pp. 101-106, tries to show that the individual words and phrases need not be Christian, and opts for a Jewish origin of this verse. He concludes, however: « Il est néanmoins clair que l'église a relu le verset 3 comme une prophétie sur la mort et la résurrection de Jésus » (p. 106); this is clear from the insertion *hōs nomizete before apokteneite auton*.

⁴⁰ J. BECKER, *op. cit.*, p. 286, confuses textual criticism and literary criticism, when he assumes that *di'auton* is a Christian correction of the original *dia touto* preserved in *g e*, and adduces as proof the use of *dia touto* in *T. Levi* 15,1; 17,9; *T. Dan* 5,8; *T. Ash.* 7,6 (cf. *T. Jud.* 23,3). Because of the parallels the latter reading must be regarded as *lectio faciliior*.

⁴¹ This is a typical covenant-scene, comparable to Josh 24,14-27. Note that the first person plural is used; this has not yet been explained satisfactorily.

⁴² *Op. cit.*, p. 297, n. 1, discussing my earlier comments on this passage, now to be found in *Studies on the Testaments*, p. 217.

⁴³ See also *T. Reuben* 6,8.

⁴⁴ On this verse see *Studies on the Testaments*, pp. 223f and p. 259. It should be studied, of course, in connection with the other Levi-Judah passages.

⁴⁵ He will even have prophetic qualities (2,10; 8,2); notice also the emphasis on insight and understanding in 4,5 and 8,2.

XII

TWO MESSIAHS IN THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS?

1. Introduction.

1.1. Studies of Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls often include a discussion of the messianic expectations in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Two early examples of this are A.S. van der Woude's important monograph *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*¹ and J. Liver's 'The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth'². Van der Woude and Liver have been followed by many other scholars until the present day. Of recent authors I mention here M. Delcor³, A. Caquot⁴, A. Hultgård⁵ and A.M. Laperroussaz⁶; we may also point to a number of publications of various nature aiming at a non-specialist

¹ Assen, 1957. See chapter II, 'Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen', 190-216. The present author discussed Van der Woude's approach in great detail in the article 'Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', *Nov. Test.* 4 (1960), 182-235, now in M. de Jonge (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation*, (S.V.T.Ps. 3), Leiden, 1975, 192-246 (see, especially, pp. 195-199 and 210-230).

² *H.Th.R.* 52 (1969), 149-185, now also in L. Landman, *Messianism in the Talmudic Era*, New York, 1979, 354-390, esp. 368-384.

³ *D.B.S.* 51 (1979), V 'Doctrines des Esséniens', col. 960-980, esp. 'Le messianisme', 974-977. Delcor mentions the Testaments only in passing.

⁴ 'Le messianisme qumrânien', in M. Delcor (ed.), *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (B.E.Th.L. 46), Paris-Gembloux-Leuven, 1978, 231-247 with only a short reference to the work of Van der Woude on p. 240.

⁵ *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches I. Interprétation des Textes*, Uppsala, 1977, see esp. Chapter I, 'Lévi et Juda' (pp. 15-81) and Chapter III, 'Le prêtre sauveur', pp. 268-381. For a convenient survey of his approach (concentrating on T.L. 18; T.Jud. 24 and T.D. 5:10-12) see his 'The ideal 'Levite', the Davidic Messiah and the Saviour Priest in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' in John J. Collins and George W.E. Nickelsburg (edd.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms* (S.B.L. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12), Chico Cal., 1980, 93-110.

⁶ *L'attente du Messie en Palestine à la veille et au début de l'ère chrétienne*, Paris, 1982, 138-148. Regrettably, this author gives a very one-sided picture of scholarly opinion on the Testaments, following mainly A. Dupont-Sommer, M. Philonenko and A. Caquot, and a corresponding evaluation of the available evidence. (For his views on the Dead Sea Scrolls, see F. Garcia Martínez's critical review of this book in *R.d.Q.* t. 11, no 43 (1983), 444-452).

audience, like P. Grelot, *L'Espérance juive à l'heure de Jésus*⁷, G.W.E. Nickelsburg and Michael E. Stone, *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism*⁸ and D. Dimant, 'Qumran Sectarian Literature' in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*⁹.

In these publications particular attention is paid to the parallels in the Testaments to the doctrine of the two Messiahs, a priestly and a royal one, which is found in the Qumran documents. Scholars are well aware of the many problems in interpreting the relatively few texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls speaking about 'the agents of divine deliverance' (a felicitous phrase used by Nickelsburg and Stone) and they realize that the passages in the Testaments which deal with the future role of Levi and Judah and of 'agents' connected with these two tribes show a great variety, but a certain parallelism between the Scrolls and the Testaments is generally assumed.

1.2. This article will not deal with the question of the unity and variety of messianic expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and of developments in the views of the Qumran sect at this point¹⁰. It concentrates on the statements concerning the future in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and will defend a twofold thesis: (1) In delivering their testaments to their descendants the sons of Jacob predict a central role for the tribes of Levi and Judah in the history of Israel. (2) Wherever 'a human agent of divine deliverance' comes into the picture, there is only one: Jesus Christ. To prove this it will deal, first, with the passages speaking about Levi and Judah and, then, with two often quoted chapters, T. Levi 18 and T. Judah 24¹¹.

All along it will be necessary to emphasize that we have to try to explain the text of the Testaments *as it lies before us*. Long ago the present author discovered¹² that Charles's eclectic edition of the text which overestimates the importance of the Armenian translation (particularly in the passages dealing with the future) was not a reliable starting-point for critical study of this document. Preparation of a new critical edition was needed. After the

⁷ (Collection 'Jésus et Jésus-Christ' 6), Paris, 1978, 77-86.

⁸ Philadelphia, 1983. Pp. 168-177 in their Chapter 5 'The Agents of Divine Deliverance' are devoted to the Testaments and the Dead Sea Scrolls (in this order!).

⁹ (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum II, 2), Assen-Philadelphia, 1984, Chapter 12 (pp. 483-550), see especially pp. 538-542.

¹⁰ On this see M. de Jonge, 'The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future according to the Qumran Scrolls' in O. Michel *et al.*, *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, Assen, 1969, 44-63.

¹¹ For a more detailed treatment of the passages concerned, see H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary* (S.V.T.Ps. 8), Leiden, 1985, *in loc.*; see also INTRODUCTION par. 7 'Expectations concerning the Future in the Testaments'.

¹² See *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*, Assen, 1953 (²1975), Chapter I, pp. 13-36.

appearance of this edition in 1978¹³ it is, unfortunately, still necessary to warn against *ad hoc* selection of readings in difficult places, using the evidence of the Armenian translation where it seems 'less Christian' and employing textual criticism to solve literary-critical problems¹⁴. Apart from these basic considerations, we shall have to ask whether it is at all possible to reconstruct the 'messianic' views of the Testaments in an earlier pre-Christian form or even, as some scholars have attempted to do, to detect different stages in the development of the views of the group which produced the Testaments and handed them on¹⁵. In other words, the question is whether the available evidence allows us to reconstruct the complex process of interpolation or redaction which led to the great variety in the passages concerned, or to explain this as the result of a long process of transmission.

Finally, it should be stressed that there is no evidence whatever that the Testaments originated, or were read, in the Qumran sect. They are a document written in Greek which uses much Jewish traditional material; among other things it incorporates notions which are also found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and shows acquaintance with Aramaic and Hebrew material found at Qumran¹⁶. For our present subject it is necessary to note that the present Testament of Levi shows numerous points of contact with fragments of an Aramaic Levi document found at Qumran (and known earlier from fragmentary texts found in the Cairo Genizah as well as Greek additions to *Ms e*). It is difficult, if not impossible, to define the exact literary and historical relationship between the Testaments and the Levi material preserved in Aramaic (and Greek). It is likely that the present testament was modelled upon a Levi document. The Aramaic Levi document reconstructed from the various fragments gives us some idea as to how the author of the Testaments worked (in general he produced a shorter text leaving out the elements which did not suit his purpose), but many details remain obscure. But we should remember that similarity of ideas or literary relationship (of some sort) do not prove a common (or at least closely related) origin or a continuous development.

¹³ M. de Jonge, H.W. Hollander, H.J. de Jonge and Th. Korteweg, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Ps.V.T.G. I 2), Leiden, 1978.

¹⁴ In this respect the current translations (with short notes) aiming at a non-specialist audience, J. Becker, *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (J.S.H.R.Z. III 1), Gütersloh, 1980 and H.C. Kee, 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', pp. 775-828 in J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol I, Garden City-New York, 1983, have to be used with utmost caution. On dubious eclecticism and wrong use of the Armenian version in A. Hultgård's *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* II, Uppsala, 1982, see the present author's review in *J.S.J.* 14 (1982), 70-80. On the relationship between textual criticism and literary criticism see M. de Jonge, 'Textual criticism and the analysis of the composition of the Testament of Zebulun' in *Studies* (see note 1), 144-160.

¹⁵ The most detailed analysis of this kind is found in A. Hultgård's studies mentioned in note 5.

¹⁶ On this, and the following, see H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Commentary* (see note 11), INTRODUCTION, 3,1; 3,3; 3,4. On Greek as the original language of the Testaments see 3,8.

2. *The Levi-Judah passages.*

2.1. With the exception of Zebulun, Asher and Benjamin all patriarchs speak about the position of Levi and Judah in the history of Israel; the pseudepigraphical position chosen by the author enables him to include the period up to his own time as well as the future in the patriarchal predictions. The passages concerned show a clear similarity in form and structure and have, therefore, been grouped together as L(evi)-J(udah) passages¹⁷.

Within this group there is considerable variety. In T.R. 6:5-7; T.S. 5:4-6; T.D. 5:4 (cf. T.N. 8:2) we find predictions of rebellion of the sons of the patriarch concerned against Levi and Judah. In these cases, as well as in a few other ones, we also find exhortations to obey these two sons of Jacob: T.R. 6:8, 10-12; T.S. 7:1-2; T.I. 5:7a-8; T.N. 8:2; T.G. 8:1; T.Jos. 19:6; cf. T.Jud. 21:1-6a; T.D. 5:9-10. More important for our purpose is that in a number of instances the predictions and the exhortations are followed by descriptions of the role assigned to the tribes (T.R. 6:5-7; 6:8, 10-12; T.S. 5:4-6; T.Jud. 21:1-6a; T.J. 5:7-8a; T.D. 5:4; cf. T.N. 5-6) and that in other cases the reason for obedience lies in the fact that salvation will come out (of one) of these tribes (T.S. 7:1f; T.N. 8:2; T.G. 8:1; T.Jos. 19:6; cf. T.L. 2:11; T.Jud. 22:2; T.D. 5:10).

2.2. The exhortation to obey Levi and Judah in T.J. 5:7-8a is very straightforward. These two tribes should be obeyed because the Lord glorified them; he 'gave an inheritance among them; and to the one he gave the priesthood and to the other the kingdom'. T.D. 5:4 explains that the predicted future rebellion of the sons of Dan against the two tribes will fail, 'for an angel of the Lord guides them both, because Israel will stand by them'.

In T.Jud. 21:1-6a we find a significant specification. Here the sons of Judah are exhorted to obey the sons of Levi and not to rebel against them because of the superiority of the priesthood (connected with heaven) to the kingship (which is concerned with earthly conditions)¹⁸.

T.S. 5:4-6 focuses on Levi and mentions Judah only in passing. Here the rebellious sons of Simeon will be conquered by Levi 'because he will wage the war of the Lord'. This expression is reminiscent of 1 Sam. 18:17; 25:28 (cf. 17:47) where it is used in connection with David. In T.S. 5 *Levi* is the warrior

¹⁷ See M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (see note 12), 86-89.

¹⁸ See in particular v. 4 which, however, mentions a significant restriction: 'As heaven is higher than the earth, so is the priesthood of God higher than the kingship on earth, unless it falls away from the Lord through sin and is dominated by the earthly kingship'. Remarkable is the transition to the second person singular in vv 5-6 (cf. a similar change in T.I. 5:4-5; do we find here (pseudo-) quotations from blessings directed to the patriarch?). We should also note the order of the sons of Jacob at the resurrection predicted in chapter 25. Levi is the first, Judah the second, Joseph the third etc. (v.1, see also v.2!).

of the Lord¹⁹, as in the Shechem episode in T.L. 5-6, where the patriarch, in a heavenly vision, receives the blessings of the priesthood (5:2) and is given a sword and a shield by the angel who accompanies him, with the express command to execute vengeance on Shechem because of Dinah (5:3; cf. 6:1). The angel promises him 'I will be with you, because the Lord has sent me' (cf. 5:5-7).

T.R. 6 is complicated because it contains two consecutive L.J.-passages; Levi is, again, the central figure whereas Judah plays a very secondary role. Vv. 5-7 predict a rebellion which will be unsuccessful because God will avenge the sons of Levi, 'For to Levi did the Lord give sovereignty (ἀρχή) and to Judah, and with them also to me and to Dan and to Joseph to be for rulers'. There is a clear distinction between Levi and Judah, and the other tribes (cf. Num. 2:10, 18, 25); Levi is superior to Judah, for sovereignty belongs to him in the first place. In the second passage vv. 8, 10-12 Levi is pictured as one who knows the law of the Lord, gives ordinances for judgment and sacrifices for all Israel. We also hear that 'he will bless Israel and Judah' (v.11). To this is, somewhat surprisingly, added 'the Lord has chosen him²⁰ to be king over all the nations'. His seed 'will die for us in visible and invisible wars and will be among you king for ever' (v.12).

Levi's task lies in the priesthood, as might be expected, and his priesthood is superior to Judah's kingship. It is this qualified juxtaposition of the two sons of Jacob that has attracted the attention of scholars studying the Dead Sea Scrolls. They have often pointed to a wider stream of tradition, represented by Jer. 33:17f; Ezek. 44-46; Zech. 4:14 (6:4-14); see also Sir. 45:6-26; 47; 49:11f; 51:12 (1-16) and, in particular, Jub. 31:9-23 (33:20). In the description of Levi's priesthood relatively little attention is paid to his sacrificial duties (T.R. 6:8; T.L. 2:10-12; 8:16-17; T.Jud. 21:5; T.L. 9:7-14)²¹. More emphasis is laid upon Levi as man of insight and teacher of Israel (T.R. 6:8, 10; T.L. 2:10; 4:2-6; 8:2, 17; 13 *passim*²²). We notice that the distinction between priesthood and kingship is not upheld in those passages which describe Levi as a warrior (T.S. 5:4-6; T.L. 5-6) or as a ruler and a king (T.R. 6:5-7, 10-12).

This variety can at least partly be explained by the author's acquaintance with the Levi document. In the Ar. Levi document we find not only extensive instructions for sacrifices (compared to which T.L. 9:7-14 gives only scanty extracts) but also a 'Prayer of Levi' (already known in Greek, and recently

¹⁹ Judah is only mentioned together with Levi in the adapted version of Jacob's prediction in Gen. 49:7 found in v.6.

²⁰ The most natural explanation is that the ἐν αὐτῷ refers to Levi and not to Judah who has just been mentioned beside Israel.

²¹ Twice, in T.L. 14:5 and T.L. 16:1, we hear of gross neglect of the sons of Levi in carrying out their duties in this respect (cf. T.L. 9:9!).

²² For T.L. 18:2-3; 7-9 see 3.1 below.

discovered in Aramaic) in which Levi asks for wisdom, knowledge and strength, and a long section parallel to T.L. 13 which speaks about the wisdom and the instruction of the sons of Levi²³. The Shechem-episode in the Aramaic Levi fragments is, unfortunately, very mutilated but there is every reason to assume that the picture of Levi found in T.L. 5-6 corresponds to that of the Levi document, particularly, because Levi acts here as a new Phinehas (cf. Num. 25; 31:6) whose zeal was regarded as exemplary already in the time of the Maccabees²⁴. Greenfield and Stone²⁵ remark that the Ar. Levi fragments consistently apply royal terminology to Levi. They point to IQ 21 Levi fragm. 1 with the expression *mlkwt khnwt* and Cambr. fragm. col c, 5-7 (corresponding to T.L. 11:4-6) where *qht* is explained in the same fashion as the verb *yqht* in Gen. 49:10²⁶. We may add that Jub. 31 (more or less corresponding to T.L. 9²⁷) records a blessing of Isaac for Levi and Judah (in this order), in which the sons of Levi are not only mentioned as priests but also as 'princes and judges and chiefs of all the seed of the sons of Jacob'²⁸ notwithstanding the fact that also Judah hears 'A prince shalt thou be, thou and one of thy sons, over the sons of Jacob' (vv 18-20).

2.3. The passages under discussion speak about the tribes Levi and Judah; in T.R. 6:12, however, there is reason to think that 'his seed' is not meant collectively, but refers to Jesus Christ as 'eternal king' who 'will die in visible and invisible wars'²⁹. We note that in T.R. 6:8 Levi's teaching activity is limited to the period 'until the consummation of times (the times) of the anointed highpriest, of whom the Lord spoke'. This highpriest is announced by Levi himself in T.L. 18 but without mentioning that he will come from his tribe. His descendants are singled out as sinners against Jesus Christ in T.L. 4:4 and in T.L. 10; 14-15; 16. In fact, when Levi is appointed as priest in T.L. 5:2 we hear that he receives the blessings of the priesthood 'until I come and

²³ See J.C. Greenfield and M.E. Stone, 'Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza', *R.B.* 86 (1979), 214-230. On p. 226 they refer for this tradition to Deut. 33:10; Mal. 2:7; Sir. 45:17. We may also mention Deut. 17:8-13; 19:16-21; 2 Chron. 19:8-11; Ezek. 44:23-24.

²⁴ See M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, Leiden-Köln, 1961, 154-188.

²⁵ In the article cited in note 22, pp. 219 and 223.

²⁶ The corresponding Greek text in Ms *e* has the expression αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἔσονται ἀρχὴ βασιλείων ἐπάτευμα τῷ Ἰσραήλ.

²⁷ Which mentions a visit by Levi and Judah, but only instruction of Isaac to Levi. The corresponding part in the Ar. fragments does not mention Judah at all.

²⁸ Vv. 14-15; cf. T.L. 8:17. See also the rest of v. 15 which emphasizes their teaching function: 'And they will speak the word of the Lord in righteousness, and they will judge all his judgments in righteousness, and they will declare my ways to Jacob and my paths to Israel. The blessing of the Lord will be given in their mouths to bless all the seed of the beloved' (cf. T.R. 6:8, 10-11a). See also the note on v. 15 in K. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (J.S.H.R.Z. II,3), Gütersloh, 1981.

²⁹ Cf. T.R. 4:10; T.D. 5:10, 13; T.Jos. 19:7 but also Justin, *Dial.* 34:2; 74:3; Eusebius, *In Pss.*, Ps. 90; *Ecl* 14 and other early Christian parallels in H.W. Hollander - M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, *in loc.*

sojourn in the midst of Israel'. Finally, T.L. 8:14 announces 'a king' who 'will arise from Judah and will establish a new priesthood after the fashion of the Gentiles for all Gentiles'. In short: T. Levi glorifies Levi as the ideal priest-teacher, but predicts grave sins of his sons in the future, and a new priest of a different order, Jesus Christ³⁰.

The picture found in T. Judah is different. T.Jud. 21:1-6, quoted above, is followed by an announcement of the sins of the sons of Judah and divisions in Israel (21:7-22:1) leading to the end of Judah's kingship *ἐν ἀλλοφύλοις* 'until the salvation of Israel comes' (22:2). The clause which follows speaks about 'the appearing of the God of righteousness' who will bring peace to Israel and the Gentiles. Clearly Jesus Christ is meant who is regarded as a descendant of Judah. V. 3b states that the predictions about Judah's eternal kingship will be fulfilled in him. This is also said *expressis verbis* in T.Jud. 24 (the passage parallel to T.L. 18) which follows after another description, in T.Jud. 23, of the future sins of Judah's offspring and the punishment which is to follow until the Lord in his compassion will bring them back from exile.

The situation is no different in T.D. 5 where v. 4 (just mentioned) is followed by an announcement of the sins of the sons of Dan together with those of Levi and Judah (vv. 5-7) leading to exile and return after repentance (vv. 8-9). Then 'there will arise unto you from the tribe of Judah and Levi the salvation of the Lord' (v. 10a). The last sentence, again, introduces a long description of an eschatological saviour and the salvation effected by him (vv. 10b-13 plus most of ch. 6) which is, in many details, unmistakably Christian³¹. It should also be noticed that T.S. 5:4-6 is the beginning of a whole sequence of statements concerning the future, which ends, in 7:1-2, with another Levi-Judah passage connecting God's salvation with these two tribes; this passage, too, bears a Christian stamp (see v. 2b)³².

2.4. Levi and Judah form the mainstay of Israel, but they envisage the future sins of their descendants. In the final stage of God's dealings with Israel and the world *one* 'agent of divine deliverance' will appear. In the Testaments, as they lie before us, this is Jesus Christ. In many of the passages already mentioned he is connected with Levi *and* Judah (T.S. 7:1-2; T.L. 2:11; T.D.

³⁰ For this view on T. Levi see also M. de Jonge, 'Levi, the sons of Levi and the Law, in *Testament of Levi X, XIV-XV and XVI*', in J. Doré, P. Grelot, M. Carrez (ed.), *De la Torah au Messie. Mélanges H. Cazelles*, Paris, 1981, 513-523. We should note that after 2:10 which speaks about Levi's proclaiming 'him who will redeem Israel' v. 11 explains: 'by you *and Judah* the Lord will appear among men, saving through them the whole race of men'.

³¹ See my article, 'The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' (to be published in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*), section 5.

³² For the sake of completeness I mention here the role of Levi and Judah in the two visions in T.N. 5-6. In the versions found in the Testaments the unity between Levi and Judah is emphasized both in 5:5 and in 6:6. For further details (also on the relationship between this version and that found in Hebr. T. Naphtali) see H.W. Hollander - M. de Jonge, *Commentary, in loc.*

5:10). T.S. 7:1-2 specify that he will come from Levi 'as a highpriest' and from Judah 'as a king', but the (high)priest mentioned in T.R. 6:8; T.L. 8:14; 18:2 is not connected with Levi. The future king, however, will be a descendant of Judah (T.Jud. 22:3; 24) and not only in T.D. 5:10, but also in T.G. 8:1 and T.Jos. 19:6 which mention two tribes in connection with the future salvation, Judah is mentioned *before* Levi. T.N. 8:2 mentions Levi and Judah, but continues with the words 'for through Judah salvation will arise unto Israel and by him Jacob will be blessed'. Here we may compare T.S. 7:1 which connects redemption with Judah in particular (καὶ ἐν Ἰούδα λυτρωθήσεσθε). In T.R. 6:12, however, the future 'eternal king' comes from Levi; in T.L. 18:3 the star of the new priest is said to 'arise in heaven, as a king'.

In short, we find that a number of different traditions concerning Levi and Levi *and* Judah were utilized, and that the Christian author/redactor incorporated this material in various ways, fitting it into his overall view on the place of Israel in God's history of salvation, and about Jesus Christ as saviour for the entire world³³. It belongs to the task of the interpreter of the Testaments to acquire an idea about the traditions used by the author; the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has increased the material which may be compared for that purpose. The finds at Qumran have not, however, put us in a better position to determine the contents of possible pre-Christian Testaments. Those who followed Charles's simplistic solution of bracketing only the unmistakably Christian expressions as interpolations³⁴ have never stopped at that. They, as well as others, have resorted to further literary critical operations, or to some theory of stages of redaction, to detect the supposedly less varied and more consistent messianic views in the reconstructed pre-Christian stage(s) of the present Testaments — which may, then, be compared with those in other documents. There is reason for considerable doubt, however, whether this approach will ever lead to more than hypothetical results. In any case our primary task is to look for consistent elements in the great variety in form and content in the text which lies before us. This point may be further illustrated by a short discussion of the important chapters T.L. 18 and T.Jud. 24 in the next section.

3. *The ideal priest and king in T.L. 18 and T.Jud. 24.*

3.1. The announcement of the coming of a new priest in T.L. 18:2 follows on the very complicated picture of a decline of the priesthood and a steady

³³ On this see again my article 'The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', which deals with the passages on the resurrection of the patriarchs, the Sin-Exile-Return passages and the Levi-Judah passages dealing with God's salvation in the future.

³⁴ The brackets in his edition remain (too) suggestive until the present day, as many of the publications mentioned in section 1 show!

deterioration in the state of the people in the previous chapter. In 17:8-10 the Sin-Exile-Return pattern can be discerned. The return to the desolate country and the renewal of the house of the Lord is, however, followed by a new period of priestly sins (17:9) followed by vengeance from the Lord and a (definitive) failing of the priesthood (18:1). In a comparable way the announcement of the new king from Judah in T.Jud. 24:1 follows immediately after the Sin-Exile-Return passage in chapter 23; chapter 24 is appended to the phrase 'the Lord will both visit you with mercy and bring you up from captivity among your enemies' in 23:5.

There are many parallels between the two chapters, as is generally acknowledged. The new priest is 'both the recipient and the dispenser of revealed, saving knowledge of God'³⁵. He 'will light a light of knowledge' and be as a sun on the earth (vv. 3-4), just as Levi himself would 'light up a bright light of knowledge in Jacob' and would 'be as the sun to all the seed of Israel' (4:2). We hear about the new priest's 'true judgement' (v. 2), the 'knowledge of the Lord' which is poured out (v. 5, cf. vv. 8-9 — the latter verse emphasizes the knowledge of the gentiles over against the ignorance of Israel). The parallel between T.L. 4:2-6 and the beginning verses of T.L. 18 (esp. vv. 3 and 7), the emphasis on knowledge and teaching (already found in Ar. Levi) and the fact that the chapter (see vv. 2, 5, 7) draws on the royal messianic oracle in Isaiah 11³⁶ (corresponding to royal elements connected with Levi's offspring in Ar. Levi) lead Nickelsburg and Stone to believe that chapter 18 corresponds to what must have been the climax of Ar. Levi. Unfortunately, however, the Genizah fragments break off somewhere in a passage which sings the praise of the wise man, corresponding to T.L. 13. There is a fragmentary text roughly corresponding to T.L. 14:3f — and that is all. We are, therefore, not in a position to know whether the author of T.L. 18 had any consistent picture of an eschatological priest before him or not, let alone, what it looked like³⁷. Nickelsburg and Stone admit this when they write: 'Although we cannot be certain of the original shape of the Jewish form of this chapter, the Greek text is interesting as a bridge between Jewish speculations about the eschatological priest and early Christian views about Jesus as a priest'³⁸. Even this cautious assessment of the situation, however, goes beyond the evidence.

One of the striking features of T.L. 18 is the clear reference to the story of the baptism of Jesus in vv. 6-7; it corresponds with a similar reference in

³⁵ So Nickelsburg and Stone, *Faith and Piety* (see note 8), p.70; they wrongly call him 'this latter-day descendant of Levi'.

³⁶ Compare v.3a 'And his star will arise in heaven, as a king'.

³⁷ J.T. Milik (who assumes some kind of treatment of weeks and jubilees in the document corresponding to T.L. 16-17) writes 'We shall never know how the author of the Aramaic Testament dealt with the final era, since chapter 18 has undergone very extensive Christian adaptation' (see his *The Books of Enoch*, Oxford, 1976, pp. 253f.)

³⁸ *Faith and Piety*, p. 168.

T.Jud. 24:2. The first verse of this chapter, corresponding to T.L. 18:3-4, reminds of Num. 24:17 LXX and Mal. 4:2 (3:20): 'and after these things a star will arise to you from Jacob in peace, and a man will arise from my seed like the sun of righteousness'³⁹. The predicted son of Judah is called 'the branch of God Most High' (v. 4; cf. Gen. 49:9) 'the fountain unto life for all flesh' (*ibid.*) and 'the sceptre of my kingdom' (v. 5; cf. Num. 24:17 M.T.). The patriarch announces 'from your root a stem will arise, and in it a rod of righteousness ...' (vv 5-6; cf. Isa. 11:1). This 'rod of righteousness' will judge the gentiles (Isa. 11:10) and save all who call upon the Lord (v. 6).

In both chapters we find a wealth of allusions to biblical prophecies; a detailed analysis shows that many of the texts referred to were also used as prophecies of Jesus Christ in the Early Church⁴⁰. No matter how much Jewish traditional material went into the making of these two chapters, and in what way it reached the author of the present text, the patriarchal words in the form before us clearly made sense to an early Christian audience. The parallels between T.L. 18 and T.Jud. 24, and the emphasis on revelation, knowledge, righteous judgment and royal activity in both chapters are to be explained by the fact that they both spoke about the same saviour: Jesus Christ.

3.2. It may be useful to add a few remarks about A. Hultgård's exegesis of these two chapters in his 'The ideal 'Levite', the Davidic Messiah and the Saviour Priest in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' which gives a good idea of the traditio-historical analysis of the Testaments found in his two books on the eschatology of this document⁴¹. Hultgård posits three stages. First there was a non-Hellenizing Zadokite group (200-150 B.C.) which produced the 'Apocryphon of Levi' used in our T.Levi. At this stage there is already an idealization of the highpriest and the priesthood 'displaying them as models of purity, of zeal for the Torah and as bringers of divine wisdom' (p.95). The second stage is represented by the original Testaments produced by Levitic sages. They also dreamed of an ideal priesthood, assisted by the Davidic Kingdom, along the lines of Jer. 33:17-18. Hultgård admits that the Levi-Judah passages have been reworked, but in and behind them he still discovers this idea (see e.g. T.D. 5:4). Interestingly, he finds no expectation of a personal priest at this stage; there are, however, 'clear hints at the hope for the Davidic Messiah' (p.95) in T.Jud. 24:4-6, T.Jos. 19:8 and T.N. 8:2-3 (where v. 3 mentions Judah only!). Unfortunately the reconstruction of the

³⁹ For Mal. 4:2 see also T.Z. 9:8. As to Num. 24:17, a well-known proof-text in the Dead Sea Scrolls, we should note that our verse refers to the LXX-version and speaks about *one* person. The word 'sceptre' in v.5 may be a reminiscence of the Hebrew version of the verse — see also my discussion with Van der Woude and Philonenko in *Studies* (see note 1), 211-213.

⁴⁰ See H.W. Hollander - M. de Jonge, *Commentary* on these chapters.

⁴¹ See note 5 above.

first two passages is very difficult and only possible with the help of the Armenian version which Hultgård (at least occasionally) values very highly. T.L. 18:2-14 and T.Jud. 24:1-3 (with T.D. 5:10-12) belong to a third stage at which the Testaments underwent a major redaction. On them Hultgård says: 'There are, however, other texts in the Testaments describing a coming ideal figure who is difficult to identify either with the ideal 'Levite' or with the Davidic Messiah. Nor is it reasonable to assume that the group which produced the Testaments could believe in all three figures simultaneously' (p.99). Although T.L. 18 no doubt incorporates elements belonging to stages one and two, it has been reworked so drastically as to form a new composition. And if T.L. 18 represents a different conception, then this must also be true of the parallel passage T.Jud. 24:1-3 which can easily be separated from 24:4-6. The same applies to T.D. 5:10-12. The (one) messianic figure found in these (and a few other) places may conveniently be called 'the saviour priest'. He combines priestly, royal and angelic elements; he overcomes the demons and evil powers, and is a universal saviour. Hultgård compares him to the idealized royal messiah in Pss. Sol. 17, the figure of Melchizedek in 11Q Melch and the Son of Man in the Similitudes of Enoch. A clear correspondance may be observed with the ruler cult and the expectations of coming saviour figures in the Hellenistic culture of the time.

Hultgård gives an interesting picture of a series of possible developments; he does not exclude, of course, final Christian additions. One may agree with him when he states: 'If we refrain from putting forward new hypotheses research will certainly not proceed' (p.94), but will immediately ask how a very complicated hypothesis like the one put forward by him can be verified. To make a comparison between what is left of the earlier Levi document and the Testaments is one thing. To distinguish two stages plus a Christian redaction in the admittedly heavily reworked Testaments must lead to a great number of assumptions which are only evident in the context of the overall hypothesis. Apart from that, Hultgård's textcritical methods and the use of textual criticism in his traditio-historical analysis are highly questionable⁴².

4. *Final remarks.*

The interpretation of the passages concerning Levi and Judah and of those about the ideal priest and the true king of the future remains difficult — even if one restricts oneself to describing and interpreting the variety and the coherence, in and between the different passages.

The variety goes, at least partly, back to the use of different Jewish traditions concerning Levi and Judah and of the Levi document represented

⁴² See note 14 above.

by the Qumran and Genizah fragments and the extra-passages in Ms *e*. The search for new parallel material and the study of traditions already known should continue. The more we get to know about the pre-history of the text and the activity of its author(s) the better. There are no clear traces of two 'agents of divine deliverance', one from Levi and one from Judah. Every time a 'messianic' figure appears, there is one, clearly Jesus Christ, who is connected with Judah, or with Judah and Levi. Once one takes seriously that the passages concerning the future intend to express a Christian point of view on Israel and the nations, and on Jesus as universal saviour, the consistency and coherence of the many different statements becomes clearer.

The passages under discussion should also be compared with (more or less) parallel interpretations of O.T. motifs in early Christian christology and eschatology. These, too, are by no means uniform: particularly as commentators of Scripture early Christian authors do not strive at a systematic presentation of beliefs.

One final example may illustrate this last point. The priest in T.L. 18 is priest for ever: 'there will be no one succeeding him for generations and generations for ever.'. This seems to be a reference to Ps. 110:4, a text quoted in Hebrews (cf. 5:6, 10; 6:20; ch. 7 *passim*) to prove that the priesthood of Jesus Christ (who is from the tribe of Judah) is of a totally different order than the levitical priesthood. Jesus Christ is called highpriest in 1 Clem. 36:1; 61:3; 64:1, Ignatius, Philad 9:1 and even 'eternal highpriest' in Polycarp, Phil. 13:2, Mart. Pol. 14:3 and Justin, *Dial.* 42:1⁴³. The tendency to emphasize the differences between Jesus' priesthood and that belonging to the old dispensation did not encourage early Christian writers to look for possible connections between Jesus Christ and Levi. In fact, the explicit announcement: 'the Lord will raise up from Levi someone as a highpriest ...' would seem to be an unlikely statement to flow from the pen of a Christian author. Would not then at least T.S. 7:2 provide a clear proof of the existence of 'two Messiahs' in pre-Christian Testaments?

In a recent article⁴⁴ I have analyzed a number of places in the first Christian commentary on Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33, Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses' which *does* connect Jesus Christ with Levi. In his commentary on Deut. 33:8-11 he quotes Ps. 110:4 and yet calls Christ a descendant of Aaron and Levi. In his commentary on Gen. 49:8-12 he admits

⁴³ Ps. 110:4 (probably also referred to in the ὁν εἶπε κύριος of T.R. 6:8) is often quoted in the *Dialogue*. Justin also uses the expression 'the eternal priest' (*Dial.* 19:4; 33:1; 34:2; 36:1; 42:1; 96:1; 118:2). See further the notes on T.L. 6:8 and 18:8 in H.W. Hollander - M. de Jonge, *Commentary*.

⁴⁴ 'Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses' and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 245-260, section 4 'Jesus Christ, priest from the tribe of Levi'.

that Jesus, though clearly descendant of Judah, was from Judah *and* Levi as king and priest. For further details the study just mentioned may be consulted. Hippolytus (and others in the early church whose objections he answers in the second passage just mentioned) could connect Jesus as priest with Levi, notwithstanding the clear statements to the contrary in Hebrews.T.S. 7:2 can be accounted for!

HIPPOLYTUS' "BENEDICTIONS OF ISAAC, JACOB AND MOSES" AND THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

1. Introduction

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs introduce the twelve sons of Jacob as authoritative teachers of the tribes of Israel. They exhort their descendants to follow God's commandments, illustrate their exhortations by examples taken from their own lives (Joseph is often singled out for special mention), and predict what will befall them if they obey or disobey God.

These Testaments have been preserved in a Christian form. Textual critics may differ in the results of their efforts to reconstruct the oldest attainable text,¹ but they will agree on the fact that their text-critical work leads to the reconstruction of a Christian text. On the question whether there ever existed Jewish Testaments, and what they contained, there is a considerable difference of opinion. The present author remains sceptical about the possibility of proving the existence of a pre-Christian document and determining its contents.² In earlier articles he has shown that the views found in the Testaments on the servants of God in the time before Moses fit in well with those found in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus,³ and that their multiform expectations concerning the future of Israel are consistent and presuppose Christian concerns.⁴ Clearly, the Testaments as they have come down to us, could function meaningfully in early Christianity before, and after, Origen, the first of the few authors which quote them.⁵

The aim of the present article is to analyse some points of contact between the

¹ In this article the recent Leiden edition by M. de Jonge, H. W. Hollander, H. J. de Jonge and Th. Korteweg, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text (Ps.V.T.Gr. 1,2)*, Leiden 1978 has been used. For a different approach and assessment see A. Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* II, Uppsala 1982, chapters I and IV (and the present author's review of this book in *J.S.J.* 14(1982)70-80).

² See his "The main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *N.T.S.* 26(1980)508-524 and compare H. W. Hollander - M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary (St.V.T.Pr.8)*, Leiden 1985, *Introduction passim*.

³ "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus", to be published in *Vigiliae Christianae*.

⁴ "The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", to be published in the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*.

⁵ See the Leiden edition, pp.XXX-XXXII. In his *In Librum Iesu Nave Homilia XV* 6 Origen writes: "... in aliquo quodam libello, qui appellatur duodecim patriarcharum, quamvis non habeatur in canone ...".

Testaments and "The Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses", the oldest known commentary on Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33, ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome, and to ask what they teach us about the position of the Testaments in the Early Church.

This commentary can be consulted in an excellent edition prepared by M. Brière, L. Mariès and B. Ch. Mercier and published in 1954.⁶ The authors use the Greek text found in Ms Meteora 573, fol. 119a-155b (ascribed to Irenaeus!) which does not include the Benedictions of Moses, two Armenian and four Georgian manuscripts. Of the Benedictions of Moses four Greek fragments all ascribed to Irenaeus are known: fragm. XVI and XVII in the edition by W. W. Harvey, one referring to Exod. 2, 18 and one found by M. Richard in a Florilegium in cod. Vatopedi 236.⁹

Hippolytus' work is one of many commentaries on books and passages of the Old Testament which bear his name or may be connected with him.¹⁰ There are also a number of fragments dealing with texts of Genesis,¹¹ the majority of which (Achelis nos. VIII-LII), comment on texts of Genesis 49. These show a number of points of agreement with the commentary on the Benedictions of Isaac and Jacob, but enough significant dissimilarities to make common authorship for the commentary and the fragments dubious.¹² We should also note that Hippolytus'

⁶ *Hippolyte de Rome. Sur les bénédictions d'Isaac, de Jacob et de Moïse* (P.O. XXVII 1-2), Paris 1954. M. Richard, *Opera Minora* I, Turnhout-Leuven 1976, no 10 (= his article "Hippolyte de Rome (saint), † vers 235" in *D.Sp.* VII, Paris 1969, col 531-71) calls it "une magnifique édition trilingue" (see col 538). In his "Les difficultés d'une édition des oeuvres de S. Hippolyte", *Opera Minora* I no 11, p. 52 we read that Ch. Mercier at the time prepared a revised edition for G.C.S.

⁷ *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis Libros quinque adversus Haereses* II. Cambridge 1857, p. 487, corresponding to passages found on pp. 123 and pp. 126-127 of the edition in P.O. XXVII, 1-2, respectively.

⁸ See R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois* (*Studi e Testi* 201), Città del Vaticano 1959, p. 23. This fragment corresponds with a passage on p. 118 – see M. Richard, *Opera Minora* I, no 10, col 538.

⁹ See his "Le Florilège du cod. Vatopedi 236, sur le corruptible et l'incorruptible", *Opera Minora* I, no 4, p. 264. This fragment corresponds with a passage on pp. 162-163.

¹⁰ See, for instance, the impressive list given by M. Richard in his *Opera Minora* I, no 10, col 536-540. The great majority of them are on the Old Testament. For details about editions see M. Gerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* I (mentioned below), nos 1871-1891.

¹¹ See ed. H. Achelis, *Hippolytus Werke* I, 2 (G.C.S.), Leipzig 1897, pp. 51-71.

¹² B.-Ch. Mercier, P.O. XXVII 1-2, pp. IX-XII distinguishes between fragments certainly not from Hippolytus and others which show points of agreement. Of these he says: "Il faudrait les confronter avec d'autres oeuvres d'exégèse pour décider s'ils sont de l'Hippolyte démarqué ou un oeuvre originale, de la même veine exégétique que celle d'Hippolyte" (p. XII). M. Richard, *Opera Minora* I, no 11, p. 58 suggests that a commentary on Gen 49 circulated apart from Hippolytus' treatise *Eis ta metà tēn ἑξαήμερον*; about these fragments he says: "Je suis tenté de croire que ces fragments proviennent d'un remaniement assez libre de ce commentaire." In his "Un fragment inédit de S. Hippolyte sur Génèse IV 23", *Opera Minora* I, no 15, p. 396 he adds: "les fragments d'un opuscule sur les bénédictions de Jacob (ch. XLIX), qui ne sont, dans l'hypothèse la plus favorable, qu'un remaniement très libre du texte originale d'Hippolyte". Here also P. Nautin may be mentioned who in *Le Dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton* (*Patristica* I), Paris 1953, p. 139 remarks "on doit être réservé sur l'attribution à Hippolyte", and M. Simonetti who assumes two authors bearing the name Hippolytus (see the controversy mentioned below). The fragments are ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome, the Commentary to an Eastern bishop of the same name (see his "Duo note su Ippolito. I. Ippolito interprete di Genesi 49", *Ricerche su Ippolito* (*Studia Ephemerides Augustinianum* 13), Roma 1977, pp. 121-126).

commentary on Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33 is the first of a series of similar works in the early Church (treated by H. Moretus¹³ and M. Simonetti¹⁴), such as Ambrosius, *De Patriarchis*, Gregorius of Elvira in *Tractatus Origenis VI* and Rufinus, *De benedictionibus patriarcharum*.

Much has been written lately about the ascription of various works to Hippolytus of Rome. M. Gerard in his *Clavis Patrum Graecorum I*¹⁵ begins his 'Nota' on the subject with the terse statement: "Multum abest ut de paternitate scriptorum Hippolyto tributorum consensus factus sit". With regard to the "Commentary on the Benedictions" we should note that M. Richard¹⁶ does not hesitate to regard Hippolytus of Rome as its author. If, however, P. Nautin's contention could be proved, that this work (as well as other writings) has to be connected with a third century bishop Hippolytus who must have lived somewhere in Palestine or Syria but whose see cannot be determined,¹⁷ this would not affect the argument of the present article. In either case it is meaningful to compare the Testaments with the first commentary on Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33, written in the first half of the third century.

2. Typology in the "Commentary on the Benedictions of Isaac and Jacob"

Hippolytus is the first Christian writer to write commentaries on books belonging to the collection that had become the Christian Old Testament. Once the mainstream of the Christian Church had accepted the Jewish Scriptures as part of the Bible alongside those Christian writings which were recognized as apostolic,¹⁸ the necessity arose to show that the Old Testament was correctly interpreted in the Christian tradition and wrongly understood by the Jews. Anti-Jewish polemics always start with arguments from Scripture; as Marcel Simon¹⁹ has said: "La base commune à tous les écrits anti-juifs réside dans une méthode identique d'argumentation: le recours à l'Écriture, dont le caractère révélé et l'autorité

¹³ "Les Bénédictions des Patriarches dans la littérature du IV^e au VIII^e siècle", *Bulletin de Littérature ecclésiastique* (Toulouse) IV,1(1909)398-411; IV,2(1910)28-40; 83-100.

¹⁴ "Note su antichi commenti alle Benedizione dei Patriarchi", *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere, Filosofia e Magistero dell'Università di Cagliari* XXVIII(1960)405-473. One should note also R. Beylot, *Commentaire éthiopien sur les bénédictions de Moïse et de Jacob*, C.S.C.O. 410/411, Louvain 1979: "L'auteur dépend étroitement de l'exégèse traditionnelle des Bénédictiones de Moïse et de Jacob, attestée par de nombreux auteurs grecs d'Hippolyte de Rome à Grégoire d'Elvire" (so the editor in his 'Avant-Propos' to vol 411).

¹⁵ Turnhout, 1983, no 1870.

¹⁶ In his contribution to *D.Sp. VII = Opera Omnia I*, no 10 and elsewhere he is followed by J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique aux II^e et III^e siècles*, Paris 1961, in his chapter on Hippolytus' typological exegesis (pp.237-248), and H. von Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* (B.H.Th. 39), Tübingen 1968, pp.314-318.

¹⁷ See his *Lettres et Écrivains chrétiens des II^e et III^e siècles* (Patristica II), Paris 1961, pp.203-207; p.205: "un évêque de Palestine ou d'une province limitrophe".

¹⁸ On this process see, amongst others, H. von Campenhausen's *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* mentioned in note 16.

¹⁹ *Verus Israel. Etude sur les relations entre chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire romain (135-425)*, Paris 1964, chapters V and VI. The quotations in the text are from p.177.

infaillible sont reconnus par les deux parties en présence". Christian theologians at the end of the second and the beginning of the third century (and later!) are convinced that "une interprétation correcte de la Bible doit suffire à faire d'eux (= les Juifs, de J.) des chrétiens, car toute vérité y est continue, et toute vérité est chrétienne".²⁰

Hippolytus has taken his task as interpreter of the Old Testament very seriously; he is a master of typology.²¹ This becomes immediately evident in the introduction of his "Commentary on the Benedictions of Isaac and Jacob" (p.2), where he asks the help of ἡ οὐράνιος σοφία in order to be able to set out in detail the things which were spoken πνευματικῶς. "Who will be able to interpret the things spoken by the blessed prophets in parables and enigmatically (διὰ παραβολῶν καὶ αἰνιγματωδῶς), if the Word does not act as his own interpreter (εἰ μὴ ὁ λόγος ἑαυτοῦ ἐρμηνεύς γένηται)?" This Word was already present in the Law, "as a lamp under the bushel, to enlighten those who were justified under the Law by circumcision, but it is now openly visible on the tree and shines as a lamp with seven branches on a lampstand in order to call the nations that are far off to salvation to his own light".

Later on, commenting on Gen 27,22a "The voice is Jacob's voice . . .", Hippolytus says: "... this means the Word that prefigured the mysteries in Jacob and that became the voice of the prophets, showing in them beforehand the things which were to come . . .".²² It is the Word of which – as he says in his comment on Gen. 49,25-26 – Mary was pregnant.²³

After his introduction Hippolytus again invokes the assistance of the Word which becomes interpreter of his own mysteries (ἐρμηνεύς τῶν ἑαυτοῦ μυστηρίων γενόμενος) as, in his next section (pp.2-8), he proceeds to explain the meaning of the dreams of Joseph (Gen 37,5-11). The Word dwelt in Joseph

²⁰ Compare also R. L. Wilken in his article "The Christians as the Romans (and Greeks) saw them" in E. P. Sanders (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition I*, Philadelphia/London 1980, (pp.100-124) who writes "The Christian apologists, contrary to the view of Harnack and his school, were engaged not in a two-fold debate between Christianity and paganism, but a three-part debate in which one factor is the continuing existence of Jewish communities well into the fifth century. Attempts to legitimate Christian religious claims had to deal not only with the philosophical objections of pagans, but with scriptural and historical arguments, offered by pagans (and Jews), but supported by the existence of a rival tradition of interpretation." (p.123).

²¹ H. von Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung* . . . (note 16), pp.314-318 calls his exegesis 'typological-allegorical', but J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique* . . ., pp.235-248 reserves the term 'allegorical' for Clement and Origen. Hippolytus stands in the typological tradition of Justin and Irenaeus. M. Richard, *Opera Omnia I*, no 10 col 545-546 follows Daniélou.

²² Compare pp.171-172 "parce que le Verbe, dès l'origine, par les Patriarches, a été figuré, puis, par les Prophètes, annoncé".

²³ See pp.108-110. Hippolytus' comment is very ingenious. First he comments on ἔνεκεν εὐλογίας μαστῶν and applies it to the two testaments ἐξ ὧν προεκκρύσσεται ὁ λόγος ἐν κόσμῳ φανησόμενος. Next he combines μήτρας εὐλογίας πατρός σου καὶ μητρός σου; the mother is Mary δι' ἧς μήτρας ἐκυφορήθη ὁ λόγος and the father is God: ἦν γὰρ ὁ λόγος ἐκ καρδίας πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ σπλάγχων ἁγίων <ὡς> ἐκ μήτρας πατρὸς γενόμενος.

and so he could reveal in visions what was to happen at the end of times. But only those who believe are able to understand the real meaning of the dreams; the sons of Jacob did not and, in fact, could not see what there was to see. Hippolytus is at pains to show that the dreams in Genesis 37 did not come true in Joseph's own life-time, not even in Egypt. Speaking about the dream in Gen 37,9-10 about the sun, the moon and the eleven stars bowing down to Joseph, he tells us that Joseph's dream became reality when the eleven apostles together with Joseph and Mary adored Christ on the Mount of Olives in the time between his resurrection and ascension.²⁴ For when Joseph dreamt his dream, Rachel had already died (Gen 35,19), and when Jacob went to Egypt it was Joseph who bowed down to him (Gen 46,29). Joseph was only the type of him who was to come. Then Hippolytus proceeds: "Let now the real, heavenly Joseph be present as interpreter (*ἐρμηνεύς*) in order that those things which through his meditation were announced by the blessed prophets, (in fact) He himself, while interpreting, may become manifest".²⁵

Hippolytus denies (pp.8-10) that the Benedictions of Jacob which he is about to interpret were meant as blessings for the sons of Jacob. It is not to be denied that the words are formulated as benedictions but, on the other hand, "we find proof of their guilt (*ἐλέγχον αὐτῶν*) and in their persons a very great prophecy (*προφητείαν μεγίστην δι' αὐτῶν δεικνυμένην*)", which became reality in their descendants. "Beforehand, Jacob set apart those benedictions by which those things were prophesied, he gave (them) to the sons of Israel, giving proof of their transgressions and he threatened them, distancing himself from such practices." In his comment on Gen 49,1 Hippolytus expresses himself a bit more clearly. This verse, he says, evidently speaks about prophecy, not about blessing (p.52); nevertheless the word *εὐλογία* is used in Gen 49,28. Must we conclude that there are manifest prophecies alongside (other prophecies) which are called benedictions? The answer is: "in the very things expressed benedictions and prophecies are given, so that the benedictions affect him who is born from Judah and is prefigured in Joseph, and, from Levi, is found to be the priest of the Father. The prophecies, however, affect those who have acted as adversaries and have despised the son of God." Isaac's words to his sons Jacob and Esau function in a similar way (pp.10-12): Jacob was blessed, and received all favours because of Christ who would be his descendant according to the flesh. Esau, "type of the former people" (*τύπον ἔχοντα τοῦ προτέρου λαοῦ*) did not receive a blessing,

²⁴ The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs situate Naphtali's first vision, in which *sun* and *moon* appear, *ἐν ὄρεσιν ἐλαίου, κατὰ ἀνατολὰς Ἱερουσαλήμ* (T.N. 5,1). The parallel vision in Hebr T.N. 2 is said to have occurred when Naphtali was pasturing the flock. Did those responsible for the present text of T. Naphtali know the interpretation of Gen 37,9-10 given by Hippolytus (cf. Ambrosius, *De Josepho* 2(8))?

²⁵ This is a difficult passage; see Mariès' note 17. Hippolytus also quotes Gen 42,23 where he takes *ὁ ἐρμηνευτής* as referring to Joseph himself.

"but Isaac reprimanded him by a prophecy" (διὰ προφητείας ἐπέπληξεν).²⁶ Does this mean that Hippolytus can only speak negatively about Israel? God has called two peoples. Isaac asked Esau to bring him food and this signifies "the appeal of the Word addressed to the former people to supply the fruit of works of righteousness" (τὴν διὰ τοῦ λόγου κλήσιν τοῦ προτέρου λαοῦ γεγεννημένην, ὡς ἀπαιτεῖ καρπὸν ἔργων δικαιοσύνης, p.12). In Manasseh and Ephraim the prophet (Jacob) shows a great mystery: there are "two callings and two peoples, the younger one is found at the right hand of Christ, through faith; the older people, that boasts in the Law, is removed to the left hand side." (pp.46-48). The comment on Deut 33,17b tells us: Thousands of the (Jewish) people were baptized, but myriads were called from the nations. Ephraim and Manasseh prefigure the two peoples (pp.174-175). In his comment on Gen 49,11 which he combines with Matt 21,1-10 (p.80)²⁷ Hippolytus says that the word addressed to Judah signifies "the two callings attached to him as vine and brought to unity by his love".

In the first two instances the two callings are connected with the activity of the Word in Israel, in the form of the Law (see also the Introduction) and with that of Christ.²⁸ In the other passages Christ calls Jews and Gentiles, and brings them together in one church.²⁹

A number of passages emphasize that Israel became dispersed among the nations because of its disobedience against Christ, the Word. Commenting on Gen 49,7 διαμεριῶ αὐτοὺς ἐν Ἰακώβ καὶ διασπερῶ αὐτοὺς ἐν Ἰσραήλ Hippolytus takes ἐν not as an indication of place but as an *instrumentalis*³⁰ and asks: Who then is Jacob and Israel other than the holy one of God, the first born servant (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ πρωτότοκος παῖς), whom they disobeyed so that they were dispersed throughout the world, having been taken captive by their

²⁶ Compare also p.30 (a blessing spoken to Jacob but fulfilled in Christ); pp.42-44 (the prophets who announced the mysteries of Christ, ought also be believed when they speak about what lies still in the future); p.70 (the words to Reuben, Simeon and Levi are, in fact, ἔλεγχος and προφητεία, but Judah receives a proper εὐλογία); pp.116-117 (again, the distinction between benedictions and prophecies in a retrospective assessment of the words of Jacob before starting the explanation of the words of Moses).

²⁷ Interestingly, Hippolytus reads τὴν ὄνον for τὸν πῶλον (1) in Gen 49,11.

²⁸ We may add one further passage: In the (rather complicated) comment on Deut 33,2-5 Hippolytus speaks about two covenants (prefigured in the fact that Moses has also given Deuteronomy), one through Moses, in the Law, for those who are circumcised, the second reserved for new people. Both covenants are mediated by the Son (pp.129-137).

²⁹ Compare also p.153 where the first two lines of Deut 33,10 are applied to the activity of the apostles who preached 'd'abord au peuple, comme étant fils de Jacob, et ensuite aux Gentils, comme étant fils d'Israël'. The Achelis fragment XXIII, presupposing the text of Gen 49,11 which has πῶλον twice, gives an interpretation of the two callings which agrees with the view expressed in the two first passages... ὑπολαμβάνομεν, τὴν μὲν ἐξ ἐθνῶν κλήσιν προσδεῖσθαι τῷ κυρίῳ, τὴν δὲ ἐκ περιτομῆς τῇ τοῦ νόμου παλαιότητι.

³⁰ See also Mariès, note 161 who points to Luke 2,34. A different interpretation is found in Achelis fragm.XVI. After having explained that 'Israel' means 'one who sees God' the text interprets ἐν Ἰσραήλ as εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ὀρῶντα τὸν θεόν.

enemies (pp.66-68)? Likewise, in his comment on Gen 49,24, Hippolytus speaks of people (evidently Jews) who put their hope in themselves and not in God. Consequently they were paralysed and came to nothing "defeated by the Word itself and given over to the Gentiles in dispersion" (p.106).

Yet Christ came also as saviour of the Jews. If and when Israel turns to the Lord it is saved. Speaking about Esau's repeated requests to receive a blessing from Isaac who has already blessed Jacob, Hippolytus explains Esau's tears (*ἀνεβόησεν φωνὴν Ἡσαὺ καὶ ἔκλαυσεν* – Gen 27,38) as a sign of repentance, and Isaac's compunction (*κατανυχθέντος δὲ Ἰσαάκ*, found only in the LXX) as "compassion of the Word for the transgression of the people". The latter is illustrated by Luke 23,34, the former is connected with the reaction of the people in Jerusalem who listened to Peter's speech at Pentecost (Acts 2,37-39). The following blessing of Esau (Gen 27,39-40) refers to Israel's sojourn in Canaan, guided by the prophets and in constant war with the surrounding nations. The phrase *καὶ τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου δουλεύσεις* refers to the present time. The prophet (Isaac) admonishes the Jews to obey and serve the saviour who came to visit his brothers according to the flesh. That will take place when they will have broken the yoke of the Law from their necks "in order that they live no longer under the yoke of the Law, but may now be saved, as free people who believe the gospel" (pp.38-42, cf. also the comment on Gen 27,29 on pp.28-30).

3. Parallels and differences between Hippolytus' Commentary and the Testaments

For Hippolytus Isaac, Jacob and Joseph are servants of the Word, and types of Christ; they are often called prophets.³¹ In the same way Moses is God's (or the Son's) faithful servant in mediating the Old Covenant and prophesying what was yet to come. Hippolytus explains Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33 for Christians, verse by verse, and attempts to define the Christian meaning of Jacob's and Moses' parting addresses as a whole and in detail. Writing for Christians he speaks about the Jews on many occasions and in various ways. For him Israel is the *πρότερος λαός* that received the Word in the form of the Law but sinned and did not accept the Word incarnate. Yet Israel did receive a new call, together with the nations, when Christ appeared and many did respond, though the great majority among the believers are Gentiles. For Hippolytus the Jews have but one option, if they wish to be saved: they have to accept the true meaning of Scripture and to believe in Jesus Christ. This way is still open. Hippolytus concentrates in

³¹ Compare the place of the *γενεὰ πατέρων ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κεχωρισμένη καὶ προφητῶν ἔργα* in the church, found in Hippolytus' description of paradise as type of the church in *Comm. in Dan.* I 18 (ed. M. Richard, "Édition du Commentaire de Saint Hippolyte sur Daniel", *Opera Minora* I, no 13, pp.5-6; the quotation is from 18,7; see also *Opera Omnia* I, no 12, pp.72-78 and I,10,col 555). See also Achelis fragm.XXXIX on Gen 49,20... *οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἐθνῶν πιστεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς ἐξάρχουσι τῆς πίστεως, τοῦτεσι πατράσι καὶ πατριαρχαῖς καὶ προφήταις...*

his Commentary on the fulfilment which has taken place and says very little about the last judgment and the final salvation.

Also in the Testaments Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as well as the sons of Jacob are men of authority. But they are explicitly introduced as teachers, as patriarchs who have lived according to God's commandments (and have, occasionally, sinned against them) and who now exhort their sons and, in fact, all their descendants to take these commandments seriously.³² If they live according to God's law and the teaching of their fathers they will be blessed; if not, they will be punished. There is, however, room for repentance; God has promised a change in the fate of Israel. In the many and manifold passages speaking about the future (with many patently Christian elements in strategic places), explicit attention is paid to the final destiny of Israel.³³ If the descendants of the sons of Jacob take God's commandments seriously they will accept Jesus Christ, the renewer of the Law, as their saviour. In the final resurrection the patriarchs and their sons will glorify God together, and share in the salvation which God has prepared for his true servants.³⁴ One example: in section 2 it was pointed out that Hippolytus regards the dispersion of the Jews as punishment for their sins against Jesus Christ. This corresponds with the so-called Sin-Exile-Return passages in the Testaments, which also view dispersion as punishment for sins, but, at the same time, speak about (repentance and) return at the end. This is also true of those passages in which the sins are clearly sins against Jesus Christ.³⁵

The concentration on exhortation – a paraenesis which is concerned with what God's true servants have observed in all periods of history –, the pseudepigraphical stance chosen for the writing as a whole and the consequent possibility of alluding to biblical passages and using expressions occurring there rather than quoting and interpreting them,³⁶ result in a very limited use of typology in the Testaments.

This is clear, for instance, in the case of Joseph. For Hippolytus, as for other

³² On the paraenetic purpose of the Testaments see e.g. H. W. Hollander, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (St.V.T.Pr. 6), Leiden 1981, chapter I. On the authority of the patriarchs as true servants of God observing his essential commandments see the article "The pre-Mosaic Servants of God . . .", mentioned in note 3.

³³ This is shown in the article "The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", mentioned in note 4.

³⁴ See, again, "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God . . ." (note 3).

³⁵ See T.L. 10; 14-15; 16; T.Z. 9,9-10,3; T.A. 7,5-7.

³⁶ The Testaments twice refer to the Benedictions of Jacob; in T.S. 5,6 *καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου Ἰακώβ προεφῆτευσεν ἐν εὐλογίαις* (compare Hippolytus' vocabulary!) and T.L. 6,6 (*ἐν ταῖς εὐλογίαις ἄλλως ἐποίησεν*), because the sons had been present when Jacob spoke these final words. In fact, in the Testaments they imitate their father; a number of expressions taken from Gen 49,1-2; 29-33 (and 50,24-26) recur in the opening and closing passages of the individual testaments. If the Testaments cannot avoid referring to passages from the Law, they resort to various devices. So Isaac instructs Levi in the law of the priesthood (T.L. 9) and the instructions laid down in Deut 25,5-10 are ascribed to the law of Enoch (T.Z. 3,4).

Christian authors,³⁷ he is a type of Christ. For the Testaments he is, first of all, a man of exemplary virtue; in his own Testament he is a man who shows *σωφροσύνη* and *ὑπομονή*; he shields his brothers and others by not disclosing his true identity; he is protected by God against temptations and in distress, and in the end his *ταπείνωσης καρδίας* is rewarded and he is exalted by God. In T.B. 3-8 he is the prototype of 'the good and holy man' guided and enlightened by God.³⁸ There is only one passage (T.B. 3,6-8) which clearly connects him with Jesus Christ; here Jacob praises Joseph for his forgiveness towards his brothers (see also T.S. 4,4; T.Z. 8,4; T.Jos. especially chapter 17) leading to a request to Jacob "that he would pray for his sons that the Lord would not reckon to them whatever evil they had devised regarding him". Jacob tells his son: "In you will be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven concerning the Lamb of God and Saviour of the world that a blameless one will be delivered up for lawless men and a sinless one will die for ungodly men in the blood of the covenant, for the salvation of the Gentiles and Israel, and will destroy Beliar and those who serve him". This passage is clearly Christian (note e.g. the expression 'Saviour of the World' and the fact that the Gentiles are mentioned before Israel); it applies Isa.52,13-53,12 to Jesus Christ and regards Joseph, in his love towards his brothers and his willingness to bear sufferings to save them as well as his attempts to remove God's punishment from them, as a type of Christ.³⁹ In other passages in the Testaments we find, at the most, some hints⁴⁰ at this typological identification. In the case of Reuben, Hippolytus in his Commentary on Gen 49 and the Testaments go entirely different ways. Gen 49,4 refers to Reuben's sin with Bilhah, told in Gen 35,22. The Testaments expand this story⁴¹ and use Reuben's sin as a warning example in an exhortation concerning *πορνεία* (T.R. 3,9-4,11). Hippolytus regards Gen 49,3-4 as a prophecy, not as a condemnation of what happened before, and he defends his approach vehemently (p.54). This prophecy refers to Israel, the first-born, sinning against the Saviour in the flesh (pp.56-60).

³⁷ Compare M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*, Assen 1953 (1975), p.123; J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique* (note 16), p.241 and also A. W. Argyle, "Joseph the Patriarch in Patristic Teaching" *Exp. Times* 67(1955-56)199-201.

³⁸ For further details see H. W. Hollander, *Joseph as an Ethical Model*... mentioned in note 32.

³⁹ See the *ἐν σοὶ πληρωθήσεται* (future tense!). Compare Hippolytus' invocation of the "real and heavenly Joseph as interpreter" (see p.249 above).

⁴⁰ According to T.Z. 4,4 Joseph was in the pit during three days and three nights (a traditional period, see 1 Sam 30,12; Esth 4,16; and Jonah 2,1 besides Matt 12,40). In T.G. 2,3 Gad and Judah sell Joseph for thirty pieces of gold (twenty pieces of gold according to Gen 37,28), but they put ten pieces in their own pockets. This may just emphasize Judah's and Gad's greed, but may also refer to the thirty pieces of silver (cf. Gen 37,28 M.T.) given to Judas in Matt 26,5 (cf. Zech 11,12). Here we may compare Hippolytus' sudden exclamation when telling the story of the humiliation and exaltation of Joseph (without bringing out the typological aspects): οὐ δὲ πωλεῖς, Ἰούδα, τὸν Ἰωσήφ ἐπιθυμία κόσμου κρατούμενος.

⁴¹ There are some parallels with Jub 33,1-9a.

In Hippolytus' view also Gen 49,5-7 directed towards Simeon and Levi do not look back to the past, in this case the Shechem episode described in Gen 34. These words envisage the sins of the scribes and the highpriests against Jesus Christ (see pp.60-68, especially p.64). They treated Jesus as they did the prophets; for this reason they were dispersed among the nations (see pp.66-68, discussed in section 2). In the Commentary on Deuteronomy 33 (pp.155-163) we find a long explanation of the reasons why Simeon was omitted by Moses. One is that Simeon was the brother most hostile to Joseph (Gen 37,20); therefore he was imprisoned in Egypt (Gen 42,24). In this he is a type of the scribes who killed Jesus. Simeon was later set free (Gen 43,23) at the arrival of Benjamin – who is a type of Christ, and this explains the reaction of Simeon in Luke 2,29!⁴²

Again, the situation in the Testaments is different. The Shechem episode is described at some length in T.L. 5-7, in such a way that Levi's zeal for the Lord and his insight in God's plans received due emphasis. Jacob's anger is mentioned, but his negative judgment in Gen 49,5-7 is disguised in the vague phrase *ἐν ταῖς εὐλογίαις ἄλλως ἐποίησεν*. Hippolytus' reference to the sins of the (high-) priests against Jesus Christ, however, finds a parallel in the very outspoken Sin-Exile-Return passages in T.Levi 10; 14-15;16 (cf 4,4 and 17-18) that condemn the sins of the sons of Levi against Jesus Christ.⁴³ As to Simeon, the Testaments emphasize his hatred against Joseph (T.S. 2,11;4,3 and T.Z. 4,11). In T.S. 5,6 there is even a direct reference to Jacob's "prophecy in his blessings";⁴⁴ but Gen 49,7b is varied so as to refer to a division of the sons of Simeon among Levi and Judah, as the result of a rebellion against Levi.

Here Hippolytus' Commentary and the Testaments have a number of points in common, notwithstanding obvious differences. Yet there is no reason to think of dependence one way or another. The connection between Simeon and the scribes is also found in Jewish sources⁴⁵ and so is the idea that this son of Jacob was particularly hostile to Joseph.⁴⁶ Tertullian commenting on Gen 49,5-6, connects the scribes and the Pharisees with Simeon and Levi and condemns their hostility against Jesus Christ (and the prophets).⁴⁷ We shall do wiser, therefore, if we

⁴² Compare also Achelis fragm.IX... γραμματεῖς γὰρ καὶ ἱερεῖς... μίαν γνώμην ἔχοντες ἀνείλον τὸν κύριον.

⁴³ See M. de Jonge, "Levi, the sons of Levi and the Law, in *Testament Levi* X, XIV-XV and XVI" in J. Doré, P. Grelot, M. Carrez (ed.), *De la Tórah au Messie. Mélanges Henri Cazelles*, Paris 1981, pp.513-523.

⁴⁴ See note 36 above.

⁴⁵ See the Fragm. Targum and marginal glosses in Targ. Neofiti on Gen 49,7; cf. R. le Déaut, *Targum du Pentateuque I* (S.C. 245), Paris 1978, p.436 and note 14 on p.435 and L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* V, Philadelphia (1925) 1955, p.367, n.387.

⁴⁶ See M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*... (see note 37), p.156, n.289 and L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* V, p.328, notes 34 and 41; p.348, n.215.

⁴⁷ "Idem erit et alibi (Deut 33,17 was quoted before) taurus apud eandem scripturam, cum Jacob in Simeonem et Levi, id est in scribas et phariseos (ex illis enim deducitur census istorum) spiritualiter interpretatur: "Simeon et Levi perfecerunt iniquitatem ex sua haeresi", qua scilicet Christum sunt persecuti..." (*Adv. Marc.* III,18 in ed. E. Evans, *Tertullian Adversus Marcion I-III*, Oxford 1972). Compare *Adv. Iudaeos* X.

explain these parallels between Hippolytus and the Testaments as the result of the common use of Jewish and Christian traditions.

For obvious reasons Hippolytus pays much attention (pp.68-84) to the words which Jacob addresses to Judah in Gen 49,8-12 (cf. pp.140-143 on Deut 33,7). Here, finally, we find *εὐλογίαι* proper and not simple *προφητεῖαι* meant as demonstrations of guilt (pp.68-70). We shall come back to this benediction in the next section; here it should be remarked that also in T.Judah this patriarch is regarded as the ancestor of the saviour-king who is to come (T.Jud 22,2-3;24). T.Jud 22,3 "... for the Lord swore to me with an oath, that my kingship will not fail from my seed all the days, for ever" and 24,4 "the branch (*βλαστός*) of the Most High ..." will be references to Gen 49,10 and 9 respectively.⁴⁸

In the case of Issachar we note that Gen 49,14-15 LXX provide the theme for the picture of this patriarch as a good farmer leading a 'simple' (*ἀπλοῦς*) life which is found in this patriarch's testament. Hippolytus (pp.86-90) describes Issachar as a type of Christ. In T.I. 5,8 there is a short and unexpected reference to the words on Gad in Gen 49,19. The word *πειρατήριον* which is used here in the LXX is connected with the Sanhedrin of high priests and scribes in Hippolytus' comment (pp.92-94). They tried to entrap (*πειράζω*) Jesus but he, like his 'type' Gad, entraps them (H. quotes Matt 21,23-27 as an example).

In the Testaments Naphtali is described as a swift messenger for his father "and he blessed me as a deer". This is a clear reference to Gen 49,21⁴⁹ where LXX translates differently. Hippolytus, as usual, comments on the Greek text.

The Testaments describe Dan's anger towards Joseph (T.D. 1,4-9) and use this as a starting-point for warnings against anger and lying. In T.D. 5 the patriarch predicts that his tribe will be particularly hostile to Levi and Judah in the future (5,6-7). Evil spirits will be active in them (v.5) "for I have read in the book of Enoch, the righteous one, that your prince is Satan" (v.6). Hippolytus, in his comment on Gen 49,16-18, sees a partial realization (v.17) in Samson, but a complete fulfilment in the Antichrist "a terrible judge and a tyrannic king" (*κριτὴς δεινὸς καὶ τύραννος βασιλεύς*), who tries to waylay all who travel on the road to truth and salvation (v.18).⁵⁰ The connection between Dan and the Antichrist is also found in Irenaeus *Adv. Haereses* V,30,2 and elsewhere,⁵¹ so that we may conclude that Hippolytus' interpretation is representative of the Christian tradition at this point. With regard to the related notion that Dan was led by Satan we may point to Achelis fragm.XXXIV which introduces a com-

⁴⁸ Cf. Justin, *Apol.* I 32,1f; 54,5; *Dial.* 52,2; 120,3.

⁴⁹ Naphtali as messenger also in Targ.Jon., Targ.Neof. and Fragm.Targ. on this verse. For further sources see L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* V, p.301, n.216; p.369, n.397 and p.371, n.422.

⁵⁰ Cf. the comment on Deut 33,22 on pp.183-185, which connects this verse with Gen 49,17, and *De Antichristo* 14-15.

⁵¹ W. Bousset, *Der Antichrist*, Göttingen 1898, pp.112-115 and K. Berger, *Die griechische Daniel-Diegesen* (St.P.B. 27), Leiden 1976, p.101.

ment on Gen 49,16 with the words λαμβάνω τοῦτο εἰς τύπον τοῦ πονηροῦ and fragm. XXXV which identifies the serpent on the way with the devil. Judas was of the tribe of Dan and he may be called ὁ διάβολος τῆς ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλεύσεως τοῦ κυρίου.⁵² Obviously, there is no clear evidence of direct contact between T. Dan and the traditions found in the Commentary and the fragments; at the most we may speak of a similarity of approach.

The last case to be treated in this section is Benjamin, whom Hippolytus, in his comment on Gen 49,27, regards as a type of Paul. The words λύκος ἄρπαξ τὸ πρωινὸν ἔδεται ἔτι are connected with Paul's persecution of the church; καὶ τὸ ἐσπέρας δίδωσι τροφήν is taken to refer to his activity as an apostle. This interpretation of Gen 49,27 is found more often in the works of Christian writers.⁵³ In the Testaments T.B. 11,1 refers to Gen 49,27 in the words "I shall no longer be called a ravening wolf on account of your ravages, but a worker of the Lord, distributing food to those who work that which is good". In vv.2-5 this is explained by pointing to the activity of a descendant of Benjamin who can be no other than the apostle Paul, called "a beloved of the Lord" (Deut 33,12). He will be completely obedient, spreading God's light among the Gentiles and even attacking Israel "with salvation", καὶ ἀρπάζων ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ διδοὺς τῇ συναγωγῇ τῶν ἐθνῶν (v.2). Here *both* halves of Gen 49,27 are connected with Paul's activity as an apostle. The nearest parallel to this curious interpretation of λύκος ἄρπαξ seems to be Ephraim Syrus' exegesis in his Comm. in Gen. XLIII 1 "Paulus qui factus est lupus lupis, eripuitque a Maligno omnes animas . . .".⁵⁴

So far we have been able to find only relatively few points of contact between the Testaments and Hippolytus. The parallels and near-parallels collected in this section can be explained by common use of Jewish and Christian traditions current in early Christianity. It is clear, however, that the study of Hippolytus' intense preoccupation with the Old Testament helps us to understand why a writing giving the parting words of the sons of Jacob could have authority in (at least certain circles of) the early Church.

Hippolytus' commentary under discussion in this article provides an example of Christian acquaintance with Jewish traditions. This is duly noted by J. Daniélou.⁵⁵ He goes, however, one step further by saying that Hippolytus made use of Jewish

⁵² Compare the variant of XXXIV-XXXV given by Achelis on pp.64-65 which says about Judas: ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ ἐγκρυβεῖς ὁ ἀρχαῖος ὄφης παρέδωκε τὸν κύριον.

⁵³ See Comm. on the Benedictions of Moses, p.127 = Ps Irenaeus, fragm.XVII and also Achelis, fragm.LII (cf. spurious fragment LXXXI: Tertullianus, *Scorpiace* 13; *Adv. Marcionem* 5,1; Origenes, *Homilia* IV,4 in *Ezechielem*).

⁵⁴ Transl. R. M. Tonneau in C.S.C.O. 152/153, Louvain 1955. Compare also the fragment of Appollinaris of Laodicea given by R. Devreesse, *Les anciens commentateurs* . . . (note 8), p.132 διαρπάσαντα μὲν πρῶτον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τῶν ὄντως πολεμίων δαιμόνων τὰ σκῦλα διανείμαντα - τουτέστι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς ἐξαγομένους ἐκ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων δυναστείας καὶ διανεμομένους ταῖς ἀρχαῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας . . .

⁵⁵ See his *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique* . . . p.238.

and Jewish-Christian exegesis before him. In his view L. Mariès, in his article "Le messie issu de Lévi chez Hippolyte de Rome" published in 1951,⁵⁶ has shown convincingly that Hippolytus found in the Testaments the notion that Jesus Christ was a descendant of Levi as well as of Judah. For Daniélou, the Testaments are a product of Jewish Christianity.⁵⁷ In this he is followed by M. Simonetti⁵⁸ whose view on the relation between Hippolytus and the Testaments, however, is more complicated. He thinks that Mariès has proved his case; the other agreements, however, prove no more than common knowledge of a variety of traditions, including typological notions. The Testaments cannot have used Hippolytus' Commentary; Hippolytus shows acquaintance with many traditions not found in the Testaments and must, therefore, have relied on other sources as well.

In any case, the question before us is: Has Mariès proved that Hippolytus knew the Testaments?

4. Jesus Christ, priest from the tribe of Levi

Mariès, accepting the common notion of his time that the Testaments reflect Jewish expectations concerning the future,⁵⁹ discusses a number of interesting passages in the Commentary which show that Hippolytus regarded Jesus Christ as a descendant from Levi.

The first passage is found in the introduction to the Commentary on Genesis 49 (p.52); it was already mentioned in section 2 above. The benedictions, says Hippolytus, affect "him who is born from Judah and is prefigured in Joseph, and, from Levi, is found to be a priest from the father". This is a rather general introductory statement, and not very precise. We note the *ἐκ τοῦ Λεὐί* besides *ἐκ τοῦ Ἰούδα*, and also the difference between *τὸν εὕρισκόμενον* (present participle) connected with Levi besides *τὸν γενόμενον* (aorist) connected with Judah. The parallel between the former participle with the *προτυπούμενον* used of Joseph suggests that Hippolytus means "is continually found in Scripture".

Next, there is the comment on the blessing of Judah in Gen 49,8-12 (pp.68-84). There is no doubt that this is a blessing, after the 'prophecies' concerning Reuben, Simeon and Levi; David will come from Judah's tribe, and Christ will descend from David (p.72). At this point, Hippolytus introduces an objection which he expects his readers will want to make:⁶⁰ why was Levi not blessed too? The objection, as always carefully reconstructed by Mariès, runs: "... for we find (descended) from the tribe of Levi the Christ shown to be priest of the Father,

⁵⁶ *Mélanges J. Lebreton*, R.S.R. 39-40(1961-1952)381-396.

⁵⁷ See his *Théologie du Judéo-christianisme*, Paris 1957, pp.23-25, where he quotes the present author's study *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (1953) with approval; he dates the Testaments around 100 A.D.

⁵⁸ "Note su antichi commenti alle Benedizione dei Patriarchi" (see note 14), pp.412-416.

⁵⁹ He follows J. Bonsirven and R. H. Charles.

⁶⁰ Compare the earlier objection on p.70.

because the tribe of Levi was merged with the tribe of Judah, in order that (by his descent) from both tribes the Son of God would be demonstrated to be king and priest" (p.72). Hippolytus agrees with this theory, as we shall see presently, but for the moment he answers (pp.72-74): Jacob knew what Annas and Caiaphas would do and therefore he could not bless Levi. Moses, however, reacted differently ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ μακάριος Μωυσῆς <τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν> ἐξ Ἀαρῶν καὶ Λευὶ γενόμενον ἠυλόγησεν." Hippolytus then quotes Deut 33,8 and tells that he will discuss this passage later. In any case, Moses supplied what is missing in the Benedictions of Jacob.

Hippolytus clearly wants to emphasize Christ's connection with Judah and Levi, and he expects his readers to be familiar with that notion. Also in a passage found in the transition between the Commentary on the Benedictions of Jacob to that on Deut 33 (pp.126-128)⁶¹ which has been partly preserved in the ps. Irenaeus-fragment no. XVII⁶² we read: ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Λευὶ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς ἐγεννήθη. On p.72 he explains Christ's descent in the words ἐπὶ τοῦ τῆν τοῦ Λευὶ φυλὴν πρὸς τοῦ Ἰούδα ἐπιμιγῆναι τὴν φυλὴν. In his Commentary on Daniel I,12⁶³ he shows how this merging took place. By means of a very special exegesis of Matt 1,11 (a difficult verse in the genealogy of that gospel) he connects Jesus Christ with Joakim, of royal descent, and Susanna, the daughter of Hilkiyah who is taken to be the priest under Josiah, mentioned in 2 Kings 22 and 23. The expression used here is οὗτοι⁶⁴ οὖν ἐκ τοῦ γένους τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ ὑπάρχοντες, ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς τῆς Λευὶ, ἐπεμίγησαν τῇ φυλῇ Ἰούδα. Anyone who reads this rather lengthy exposition cannot but admire Hippolytus' ingenuity; at the same time it is clear that he would never have combined Sus. 1-2 and Matt 1,11 in such a roundabout way, unless the connection of Christ with Levi and Judah was very important to him and his readers.

In both passages just mentioned the tribe of Levi is merged with that of Judah. It is, of course, Christ's descent from Levi that has to be demonstrated, not his descent from Judah. In this respect it is interesting to note Hippolytus' argumentation in his comment on Deut 33,8-11 (pp.144-146). Here he quotes part of

⁶¹ Here Hippolytus comments on Deut 27,12. In the Hebrew text and that of LXX the six tribes standing on Mount Gerizim to bless the people were Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Joseph and Benjamin, but Hippolytus replaces Issachar by Zebulun both in his quotation and in his comment. The most prominent tribes Joseph, Levi and Judah are mentioned first in Hippolytus' comment, and the wording resembles that of the introductory statement on p.52 (quoted above). Also Simeon, Zebulun and Benjamin are typologically related to what happened later. Simeon, the patriarch, is connected with the Simeon of Luke 2,25-35. The connection between Zebulun and Isa 9,1-2; Matt 4,15-16 is also found on p.86 in the Commentary on Genesis 49. For the connection between Benjamin and Paul see also the passages mentioned in section 3 above.

⁶² See note 7 above.

⁶³ See M. Richard, *Opera Minora* I, no 10, col 538.

⁶⁴ I.e. Susanna and her brother Jeremiah(!). See the edition of the *Commentary on Daniel* by M. Lefèvre in S.C. 14, Paris 1946 and Lefèvre's notes on I 12.

Ps. 110,4 and calls Christ the priest of the 'most high and invisible God'. Christ is a priest from Levi and Aaron, according to the flesh, and, at the same time, a priest according to the order of Melchizedek – contra Hebrews 7. Hippolytus has the connection with Judah in mind: he emphasizes the Davidic authorship of the psalm, he reads: "You will be *for me* priest into eternity", and he ascribes the word of an unknown man of God to Eli in 1 Sam 2,35⁶⁵ to the prophet Nathan operating in the time of David and responsible for the well-known blessing of the house of David in 2 Sam 7,4-16.⁶⁶

Where did Hippolytus find the notion that Jesus Christ as priest was a descendant of Levi? Mariès' answer on the last two pages of his article is very short and simple. First, he notes that Hippolytus uses the verb *εὐρίσκειν* in the passages on p.52 and on p.72. This presupposes that there was a document which taught what he wants to maintain. And because T.S. 7,2 announces that the Lord will raise up *ἐκ τοῦ Λευὶ ὡς ἀρχιερέα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰουδα ὡς βασιλέα θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον* and T.G. 8,1 has a similar prediction, Mariès concludes that Hippolytus must have known the Testaments.⁶⁷

This argument is simplistic. First, *εὐρισκόμενον* on p.52 is used parallel with *προτυπούμενον*; this suggests that Hippolytus meant that he read this in Scripture. On p.72 Hippolytus mentions the argument of the 'merging' of the tribes for which, elsewhere, he adduces scriptural support.⁶⁸ There is no need to suppose here knowledge of an extrascriptural authority.

Secondly, Mariès in his search for parallels did not take into account the great variety in the passages in the Testaments speaking about Levi's priesthood and about the connection of the future salvation/saviour with Levi and Judah.⁶⁹ It remains remarkable, however, that there is very little evidence for the notion of Jesus' descent from Levi outside Hippolytus and the Testaments.⁷⁰ This fact does not prove literary dependence one way or another. The fact that Hippolytus assumes that people will naturally connect Jesus and Levi (p.72!), emphasizes Jesus' descent from Levi and tries to prove this exegetically, shows that it must

⁶⁵ Only part of the verse is quoted (freely). Hippolytus omits "and I will built him a sure house and shall go in and out before my anointed one for ever".

⁶⁶ For the sake of completeness I mention also the comment on 1 Sam 16,1-2 found in Hippolytus' *On Elkanah and Hannah* (ed. Achelis, fragm I, on p.121) with the phrase ... τὸν ἐκ Δαβὶδ βασιλέα τικτομένον, καὶ τοῦτον ὑπὸ πατρὸς βασιλέα καὶ ἱερέα χριόμενον.

⁶⁷ Mariès also connects, less convincingly, T.L. 8,14 and 18,2 with the expression *ἄνδρα καινὸν ἀνόμασεν* in his reconstruction of the Greek text of Hippolytus' comment on Deut 33,8-13 (pp.145-146 and n.338 in his edition).

⁶⁸ Compare the use of *εὐρίσκομεν* on p.10, lines 2 and 9 where the verb clearly refers to passages from Scripture.

⁶⁹ See "The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" (see note 4), section 4 and H.W. Hollander-M. de Jonge, *Commentary* (see note 2), *Introduction* 7.3.

⁷⁰ For details, see H. W. Hollander-M. de Jonge, *Commentary, Introduction* 8.4. An important passage is 1 Clem 31-32; on this, see A. Jaubert, "Thèmes lévitiqes dans la Prima Clementis", *Vigiliae Christianae* 18(1964)193-203.

have been a wide-spread notion. This helps to explain why Levi and Judah occupy such prominent places in the Testaments, and why a number of passages connect God's salvation in the future with these two tribes – though in a variety of ways. The findings in this section corroborate the conclusion reached at the end of section 3. The evidence discussed here does not allow us to establish a close relationship between Hippolytus' "Commentary on the Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses" and the Testaments. Hippolytus' treatment of the question of Jesus Christ's connection with Judah and Levi shows considerable light, however, on an important theme in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

Summary

This article compares one of the earliest Christian biblical commentaries, that of Hippolytus on the "Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses" (published in 1954 by M. Brière, L. Mariès and B. Ch. Mercier in *Patr. Or.* 27,1-2) with the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. If the latter document in its present form has to be dated in the second half of the second century A.D. and should be studied in the context of the Christian literature of the period around 200 (as the author has tried to argue on several occasions) comparison of their views on the sons of Jacob with those of Hippolytus – who devotes much space to the interpretation of Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33 – is called for. Hippolytus is a master of typological interpretation. For him it is clear that the actual blessings found in these chapters aim at Christ and the Christian Church, and that the prophetic warnings are directed to those who acted as adversaries and despised Christ. Hippolytus writes for Christians and stresses the negative response of the Jews. The Testaments introduce the Patriarchs as teachers who try to bring out the essential meaning of God's commandments, urging Israel to pay heed to the final call to obey them: Israel should accept Jesus Christ, the renewer of the Law. In the Testaments there is explicit attention for Israel's final destiny.

Notwithstanding the difference in literary genre and theological outlook, there are a number of interesting parallels between Hippolytus' Commentary and the Testaments, which are treated in the third section of the article. They have to be explained by common use of Jewish and Christian traditions. Important is the agreement of Hippolytus and the Testaments with regard to the notion of Jesus' descent from Judah and Levi. Here, too, there is no proof for literary dependence one way or the other – contrary to what L. Mariès and others have thought.

TWO INTERESTING INTERPRETATIONS OF THE RENDING OF THE TEMPLE-VEIL IN THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

1. Introduction

The accounts of the passion in the Synoptic Gospels recount that, at Jesus' death, the curtain of the temple was torn in two, from top to bottom. Mk 15,38 mentions this as a separate incident between Jesus' death and the confession of the centurion. Luke connects it with the darkness which covered the land for three hours and mentions it just before Jesus' last cry and the reactions of the officer and other people present (23,44-48). Matthew follows the order found in Mark, but mentions many other events besides: trembling of the earth, splitting of the rocks, opening of the tombs, resurrection of the saints who had fallen asleep (27,51-3).

It is not immediately clear what significance is attached to the incident in the three gospels and, in fact, scholars have differed in their interpretations down to the present day. Some interpreters explain the incident, in the light of Heb. 6,19; 9,3; 10,20 as a sign of the beginning of the new dispensation; others regard it as a warning of the coming destruction of the city of Jerusalem and the temple. Commentaries on the three passages show a great variety of nuances in interpretation; they also remind us of the probability that the report of the incident may have had a different function and meaning in the context of the different gospels.¹

Not only modern scholars have found it impossible to reach agreement on the interpretation of the passages concerned. Early Christian interpreters, too, display a wide variety of opinion concerning the meaning of the event.²

¹ See my earlier article "De berichten over het scheuren van het voorhangsel bij Jezus' dood in de Synoptische evangeliën", *Ned. Theol. Tijdschrift* 21(1966-7)90-114. For recent interpretations of the Markan account see, for instance, R. Pesch, *Das Markus-Evangelium II*, Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1977, pp.498-9 (lit. pp.502-3); Harry L. Chronis, "The Torn Veil; Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37-39", *J.B.L.* 101(1982)97-114; Frank J. Matera, *The Kingship of Jesus* (SBL Dissertation Series 66), Chico CA 1982, pp.137-140.

² See my article in the previous note, and also "Het motief van het gescheurde voorhangsel van de tempel in een aantal vroegchristelijke geschriften", *Ned. Theol. Tijdschrift* 21(1966-7)257-276; compare "Christelijke elementen in de Vitae Prophetarum", *Ned. Theol. Tijdschrift* 16(1961-2)161-178. Among earlier publications should be mentioned Campbell Bonner, "Two Problems in Melito's Homily on the Passion", *H.Th.R.* 31(1938)175-190 and A. Pelletier, "La tradition synoptique du 'voile déchiré' à la lumière des réalités archéologiques", *R.S.R.* 46(1958)161-80. Pelletier's article (one of several from his hand on the subject) has now been supplemented by S. Légasse, "Les voiles du temple de Jérusalem. Essai de parcours historique", *R.B.* 87(1980)560-589, but this does not yield much for our subject. A

The present author became interested in the matter, when he found two interpretations of the incident in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (T. Benjamin 9,4 and T. Levi 10,3) and discovered a number of interesting (near-)parallels in early Christian literature.³ These parallels supply one argument, amongst many others, in favour of the thesis that the Testaments in their present form should be regarded as a Christian document and must be studied in the context of early Christian literature.

The present essay starts with a discussion of T.B. 9,4 and T.L. 10,3 as part of the Testaments. It then relates the interpretations found in these two passages to similar ones in early Christian writings. It concentrates on interpretations which can be connected with those found in the Testaments and does not aim at giving a full survey of all material available. We should note that the majority of the parallels is not taken from writings belonging to (what we might call) the mainstream of Christian theology in East and West. We find, for instance, the *Sibylline Oracles* and the *Lives of the Prophets*, "pseudepigrapha" which may be compared with the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in that they have a long history of collecting and editing behind them and have been handed down in Christian circles. Melito's *On Pascha* occupies an important place. It is an early homily, the first in a series of sermons of often uncertain authorship, some of which are quoted in this article. We should also mention the *Ps. Clem Recognitions* and the *Syriac Didascalia*, and note that a rich collection of relevant material is found in Tatian's *Commentary on the Diatessaron* written in Syriac around 370. This leads to the question what conclusions can be drawn with regard to this type of exegesis of biblical texts in early Christianity. The last section of this article addresses itself, briefly, to this problem.

2. T.B. 9,4 and T.L. 10,3

2.1 There is almost unanimity among recent interpreters with regard to the Christian origin of T.B. 9,3-5⁴ which – speaking about the visitation of an

useful survey of early Christian views is found on pp.583-6 of P. Lamarche S.J., "La mort du Christ et le voile du temple selon Marc", *N.R.Th.* 106(1974)583-99, esp. pp.583-6 (Lamarche is indebted to the articles of A. Pelletier and M. de Jonge). In the present article use could be made of *Biblia Patristica* I-III, Strasbourg 1975-80.

³ See, already his doctoral thesis *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*, Assen 1953 (1975), pp.123-124. For a more detailed exegesis of T.B. 9,4 and T.L. 10,3 see H. W. Hollander – M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, A Commentary*, (St.V.T.Ps. 8), Leiden 1985.

⁴ See R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford 1908, and his commentary *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs translated from the Editor's Greek Text*, London 1908 on this passage; J. Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (A.G.J.U. 8), Leiden 1970, pp.253-4; A. Hultgård, *Leschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* I, Uppsala 1977, pp.161-3; H. W. Hollander – M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, on this passage. On M. Philonenko's defence of a Jewish background in his *Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* (Cahiers de la R.H.P.R. 35), Paris 1960, See M. de Jonge, "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" in M. de Jonge (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (St.V.T.Ps.3), Leiden 1975, pp.193-246, esp. pp.236-8.

only-begotten prophet (v.2) – reads “and he will enter into the first temple and there the Lord will be outraged and set at nought and lifted upon a tree. And the veil of the temple will be rent, and the spirit of God will pass on to the Gentiles, as a fire that is poured out. And he will rise from Hades and ascend from earth unto heaven. And I knew how humble he will be and how glorious in heaven.”⁵ In traditional Christian terms⁶ this passage connects Jesus’ passion and death, the rending of the temple-veil, Jesus’ (descent to and) rising from Hades and his ascension to heaven. We are reminded here of T.L. 4,1, a description of God’s final judgment containing a number of reminiscences of Mt 27,45,51ff.: “when the rocks are being rent”, “the sun quenched”, “Hades despoiled at the suffering of the Most High”. A similar sequence occurs in many descriptions of Jesus’ passion. By way of example see Or.Sib. 1,372-382; 8, 305-312, which also mention the rending of the temple-veil as “a great sign” (1,377) and as an indication that “that which had been hidden was again made manifest” so that one must no longer “serve the phantoms of the world” “with secret law and temple” (8,307f.).⁷ We may also point to Melito’s homily *On Pascha*⁸ which, after an elaborate description of Jesus’ passion and death (including a highly remarkable interpretation of the rending of the curtain of the temple in §98 to which we shall return below), continues with his resurrection and ascension (§100) and emphasizes his victory over death and his triumph over Hades (§101-2). The same is found in sections 10-12 of the New Fragment II in the edition by S. G. Hall.⁹ In all these instances the combination of the rending of the temple-veil with the resurrection of the dead in Mt 27,51-3 has provided the starting-point.¹⁰ In T. Benjamin, the rending of the curtain of the temple stands out in this succession of events in that its significance is explained. The curtain is called τὸ ἄπλωμα τοῦ ναοῦ. The word ἄπλωμα (“that which is unfolded or spread out”) is only seldom used for the curtain of the temple. An interesting parallel is found in *Vit. Hab.* 12 τότε τὸ ἄπλωμα ...

⁵ Translation of the text in M. de Jonge c.s., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A critical edition of the Greek text* (Ps.VT.Gr. I 2), Leiden 1978, which reads μεταθήσεται in v.4 with *gleafc*⁺ over against καταθήσεται (*bkd*); and ἀναβάνων in v.5 with *pk*, where *gleafc*⁺ have μεταβαίνων (*d: καταβ.*).

⁶ See H. W. Hollander – M. de Jonge, *Commentary* and Hultgård (n.4).

⁷ A. Kurfess, in E. Hennecke - W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* II, Tübingen 1964, pp.500-1, dates books 1-2 in their present redaction around 150, book 8 ± 175. J. J. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles* in James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* I, Garden City-New York 1983, pp.331,416 agrees with regard to books 1-2, but is somewhat more cautious as to book 8 (which must in any case be dated before Lactantius who quotes 8.305f. in his *Div. Inst.* IV,19,5).

⁸ See S. G. Hall, *Melito of Sardis. On Pascha and fragments*, Oxford 1979.

⁹ This is a Georgian fragment, see p.XXXIX of Hall’s edition, but M. Richard has been able to reconstruct the Greek text behind it in some places, see “Témoins grecs des fragments XIII et XV de Méli-ton de Sardes” in *Le Muséon* 85(1972)309-336 (= *Opera Omnia* I, Turnhout-Leuven 1976, no.7).

¹⁰ There is, of course, also 1 Pet 3, 18-23 – see, e.g., L. Goppelt, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, Göttingen 1978 on this passage, with an excursion on the *Descensus ad inferos* (pp.250-254).

τοῦ δαμῆρ εἰς μικρὰ ῥαγήσεται.¹¹ The rending of the curtain enables the Spirit of God to depart to the Gentiles, as fire that is poured out (cf. Joel 2,28f. and Acts 2,17 (and v.3!); 10,45). "The Spirit of God" stands here for the Divine Presence in the temple, elsewhere represented by the angel of God, as we shall see presently.¹²

2.2. T.L. 10,3 forms part of a disquisition on the future sins of the sons of Levi, the priests in Jerusalem, against Jesus Christ and the consequent punishment for these sins. It is the first Sin-Exile passage in a whole Sin-Exile-Return complex consisting of chapters 10, 14-15 and 16 that occupies a prominent place in the present T. Levi. This work glorifies Levi's priesthood but denounces the sins of his sons and predicts the coming of a new priest (not from his tribe), Jesus Christ.¹³ T.L. 10,2, accordingly, announces "ungodliness and transgression which you will commit at the consummation of the ages against the saviour of the world, acting godlessly, leading Israel astray". Punishment will follow; in v.4, as often in S.E.R. passages, this is exile; v.3 refers to another intervention by God: "and you will act lawlessly together with Israel, so that he (the Lord) will not bear Jerusalem because of your wickedness, but will rend the covering of the temple so as not to cover your shame."

This verse is not without difficulties, because the active verbs lack a clear subject; this has led to the change of σχῆσαι to σχίσθησεται in a number of manuscripts (*ld(m)chij*) which must be secondary. The simplest solution is to introduce "the Lord", mentioned at the end of v.2, as subject.¹⁴ Recent interpreters differ in their opinions concerning the degree of Christian influence in this passage. The expression εἰς τὸν σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου is bracketed by Charles as a Christian interpolation,¹⁵ and in this he is followed by most scholars. With regard to v.3 he has a curious argumentation: comparing the expression τὸ ἔνδυμα τοῦ ναοῦ with the reading τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ in *chij* (which is clearly easier and therefore secondary) he remarks: "but ἔνδυμα is decidedly a bad rendering. Possibly τοῦ ναοῦ

¹¹ See the edition of the recensio anonyma by C. C. Torrey, *The Lives of the Prophets* (J.B.L. Mon. Ser. 1), 1946, p.29. Compare also the other recensions in the edition of Th. Schermann, *Prophetarum Vitae Fabulosae* etc., Leipzig 1907, pp.21, 14f.; 33,11f.; 58,12f; [87,1f.]; 102,20f. We should note that the verb ἀπλῶ is often used of Jesus Christ who extends his hands or his body on the cross (see Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. A 1).

¹² See also the interesting article by G. G. Stroumsa, "Le Couple de l'Ange et de l'Esprit: traditions juives et chrétiennes", *R.B.* 88(1981)42-61.

¹³ On Sin-Exile-Return passages in general see H. W. Hollander - M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, Introduction §7.2. On T.L. 10; 14-15; 16 in particular see M. de Jonge, "Levi, the sons of Levi and the Law in Testament Levi X, XIV-XVI and XVI" in J. Doré, P. Grelot, M. Carrez (ed.), *De la Torah au Messie. Mélanges Henri Cazelles*, Paris 1981, pp.513-523 and "The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" (to be published in the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*).

¹⁴ The Leiden edition of 1978 prefers κατακαλύπτειν (b as more difficult reading to the more usual καλύπτειν *gld m eaf* (cf. καλύψαι *chij*) which may also be the result of haplography. The meaning of the passage is not affected here.

¹⁵ See his *Text and Commentary* (see n.4) on this verse.

is an interpolation and the text spoke only of a rending of their garments whereby their shame should be exposed.”¹⁶ J. Becker¹⁷ and D. Haupt¹⁸ rightly reject this impossible theory,¹⁹ and also Philonenko’s thesis that this refers to the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey and his army in 63 B.C., when Roman soldiers went into the inner part of the temple.²⁰ A. Hultgård, unconvincingly, takes Jerusalem as subject of the verb σχίσαι: Jerusalem itself rends the covering of the sanctuary. He must confess, however, that it is difficult to determine the precise meaning of the phrase τὸ ἔνδυμα τοῦ ναοῦ. “C’est probablement une métaphore qui, s’inspirant du voile ou des voiles du Temple, est liée à la mention de la découverte subite de l’impiété des prêtres.”²¹ One may differ with regard to the extent of Christian editorial activity in this passage; the present author prefers interpreting the text as it stands to trying to establish the meaning of a so-called original version of it. In the present text the garment (covering) of the temple is rent so as not to cover the shame of the priests. The expression ἀποκαλύπτειν (or μὴ (συγ-)καλύπτειν) ἀσχημοσύνην is often used in connection with sexual sins: see Lev 18,6ff.; 20,11.17f.; Ezek 23,10.18; 16.36; Sir 26,8. God uncovers Israel’s (or Jerusalem’s) shame by way of punishment for these sins; see Ezek 23,29; 16,(8).37; Hos 2,2(5), 8f. (11f.). The metaphor is traditional; the connection between “garment” and “temple” is the interesting new element in T. Levi.²² It invites us to look for other instances, where the temple-veil is regarded as the garment of the personified temple or of an angel who is supposed to dwell in the sanctuary.

3. Parallels in early Christian literature

These two texts in the Testaments may be compared with many passages in early Christian writings which presuppose similar views on the meaning of the incident with the curtain of the temple at Jesus’ death. They present themselves as variations on a number of related themes rather than as stages in the development of some leading ideas, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to divide the different interpretations into precise categories or to sketch pro-

¹⁶ Quotation from his *Commentary* on v.3; there is a similar note in his *Text*.

¹⁷ In his *Untersuchungen* (see n.4), pp.280-1.

¹⁸ In his *Das Testament Levi. Untersuchungen zu seiner Entstehung und Ueberlieferungsgeschichte* (Diss. Masch. Halle-Wittenberg 1969), pp.100-1.

¹⁹ They refer to the present author’s *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Assen 1953, pp.123-4, a first attempt to deal with the theme of the temple-veil. Curiously, Charles’ hypothesis recurs in H. C. Kee’s note on this verse: “The figure of speech here describing the temple-veil as covering Israel’s shame is awkward and may have been altered by a Christian editor from an original reference to ‘garment’” (see H. C. Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs”, in J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha I* (see n.7), pp.775-828).

²⁰ See his *Les interpolations chrétiennes* (see n.4), p.18.

²¹ See *Leschatologie I* (see n.4), pp.93-6 (quotation from p.96).

²² After the reference to future exile in T.L. 10,4, v.5 explains (see γὰρ) why the Lord acted as described in v.3: “the house which the Lord will choose will be called Jerusalem.”

gress in the thinking about the subject. A good example is Ephraim Syrus who in his *Commentary on the Diatessaron* XXI,⁴²³ gives no less than five interpretations without really choosing one of them: 1. The Lord wanted to show that He had given the kingdom to a people which gives fruit (a little later he adds: the Lord took away the spiritual riches of the Jewish people) (Mt 21,43). 2. The Spirit of God left the temple which could now be destroyed. 3. The Spirit rent the curtain to show the impudence and insolence of the Jewish people – just as the highpriest rent his garment and threw it away. 4. The Lord rent the veil of the door through which Judas had gone when he threw his money into the temple. 5. The veil was rent because they had stripped Jesus of his clothes. Explanation no.2 may be compared with that given in T.B. 9,4; explanations 3 and 5 show how the curtain could be compared to a garment. Both aspects are also found in XXI,6. Here, the Spirit is said to rend the veil which served him as garment of honour. A little further Ephraim speaks of the Spirit of prophecy which dwelt in the temple to announce Christ's coming to mankind and flew away immediately to announce his ascension to heaven. XXI,6 gives yet further interpretations: The Spirit rent the veil and fled from the temple and called as witnesses the saints who had just left the tombs (Mt 27,52-3); also the Spirit is regarded as a source of royal authority and priesthood; he left the temple taking kingship and priesthood with him. In XXI,5 the events mentioned in Mt 27,51-2, including the rending of the curtain, are interpreted as signs of mourning, for the Saviour who died and for the impending destruction of the temple. It is clear that Ephraim brought here together that which he had read in earlier writers, no doubt adding what he himself had discovered in his meditations on this theme.

In any case, many points he makes are found in the works of earlier and later authors. In the *Didascalia Apostolorum* XXIII²⁴ we find a long disquisition on the theme: God abandoned the people of the Jews and the temple, and has come to the church of the Gentiles. The author quotes a number of proof-texts from the Old Testament and also alludes to Mt 27,51. "As He then abandoned the (Jewish) people, so also did He desert the temple, (leaving it) to them desolate. And He rent the curtain and took away from it the Holy Spirit, and poured Him upon those who believed from among the Gentiles, as He said to Joel: I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh." The parallel to T.B. 9,4 is obvious. Tertullian, *Adv. Iudaeos* XIII 15²⁵ in a comment on Mt 27,51-53, including the rending of the curtain of the temple, compares the Jewish synagogues in the Dispersion with the cisterns of Jer 2,13 which could

²³ See L. Leloir, *Ephrem de Nisibe. Commentaire de l'Evangile concordant ou Diatessaron traduit du Syrien et de l'Arménien* (S.C. 121), Paris 1966, pp.376-8.

²⁴ Ed. A. Vööbus, *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac I-II* (C.S.C.O. Script. Syr. 175-6; 179-80), Louvain 1979. The following quotation is found in vol.180, pp.210-1.

²⁵ Ed. H. Tränkle, *Q.S.F. Tertulliani Adversus Iudaeos*, Wiesbaden 1964.

hold no water. He explains: "in quibus iam spiritus sanctus non immoratur, ut in praeteritum in templo commorabatur ante adventum Christi qui est verum dei templum". In *Adv. Marcionem* IV 42 Tertullian speaks of an angel leaving the temple. "Also the veil of the temple was rent, by the breaking out of the angel, who deserted the daughter of Sion, leaving her as a watch-tower in a vineyard and a lodge in a garden of cucumber"²⁶ (a clear reference to Isa 1,8).

The same verse of Isaiah is commented upon by Eusebius, *Commentaria in Isaiam* (MPG 24,92-3). The guardsman, earlier identified as the Holy Spirit, leaves the σκηνή, that is the temple; σκηνωμα γὰρ δόξης ἐλέγето. Elsewhere, in his *Comm. in Lucam* (MPG 24,605B), Eusebius presents a related but different interpretation. When the curtain of the temple was rent, the angels which lived of old in the temple tore their garments, yes they rent the venerable woven fabric, so that the temple would be naked and bare, without their protection, open to all enemies. Eusebius introduces a multitude of angels, clearly under the influence of Josephus, whose report on the portents preceding the fall of the temple is quoted by him several times in his works.²⁷ In *B.J.* VI §§ 299f. we read: "Moreover, at the feast which is called Pentecost the priests on entering the inner court of the temple by night, as their custom was in the discharge of their ministrations, reported that they were conscious, first of a commotion and a din, and after that of a voice as of a host: 'We are departing hence'" (μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα φωνῆς ἄθροας "μεταβαίνόμεν (or -ωμεν?) ἐν τεύχεσιν").²⁸ We may compare here Tacitus, *Historiae* V 13 "... Apertae repente delubri fores et audita maior humana vox, excedere deos; simul ingens motus excedentium ..."

²⁶ Transl. E. Evans, in *Tertullian Adversus Marcionem* I-II, Oxford 1972. "Scissum est templi velum, angeli eruptione, derelinquentis filiam Sionis tanquam in vinea speculam et in cucumerario casulam."

²⁷ See his *H.E.* III,8,1-9; *Dem. Ev.* VIII, 119; *Ecl. Proph.* III 48, and comp. Eusebius, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus* ed. R. Helm, Leipzig 1913, p.175. Hieronymus often refers to the Josephus passage himself, see his *Comm. Ev. Matth.* 27:51; *Epist.* 18A,9 ad Damasum and *Epist.* 120,8 ad Hedybiam.

²⁸ Transl. H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus III* (Loeb Classical Library), London-Cambridge (1928) 1961. See the entire section *B.J.* VI §§288-315. For other Jewish traditions see Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch* I, München 1922, pp.1045-6, and the notes on this section in O. Michel - O. Bauernfeind, *De Bello Judaico - Der Jüdische Krieg* II 2, Darmstadt 1969, pp.179-92. Important for Josephus' view on the fate of Jerusalem is also his speech recorded in *B.J.* V, §§.362-419 in which he accuses the insurgents of having polluted the temple and insulted their only helper and ally, God (cf. §§.377), 380, 402 and especially 412f.) "My belief, therefore, is that the Deity has fled from the holy places and taken His stand on the side of those with whom you are now at war." (see also *B.J.* VI, §§127f.). We should note that *Vit. Hab.* 11-13 makes Habakkuk announce the end of the temple: "Concerning the end of the Temple, he pretold that it would be brought to pass by a western nation. Then, he said, the veil of the inner sanctuary will be torn to pieces, and the capitals of the two pillars will be taken away, and no one will know where they are; but they will be carried away by angels into the wilderness where in the beginning the Tabernacle of Witness was pitched." (transl. C. C. Torrey, see n.11). Compare also *Syr. Apoc. Bar.* 6-8 where angels carry away a number of holy objects from the Holy of Holies before admitting the enemies to the city. "Enter, enemies and come, adversaries, because he who guarded the house has left it." (8,2 transl. A. F. J. Klijn, 2 *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* in J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* I, pp.615-52.

Next there are two passages of Hilary of Poitiers. Describing that which followed on the death of Christ in his *Comment. in Matth.* 33,²⁹ he writes "Et deinceps velum templi scinditur; quia exinde populus est divisus in partes, et veli honor cum custodia angeli protegentis aufertur". In his *Tractatus in Psalm. LVIII* 10³⁰ he does not speak of an angel, but of a "spiritual protector": "... velum templi tamquam custodia illinc spiritali erumpente discinditur". Melito of Sardis, in his homily *On Pascha* §98 describes the curtain as the garment of the angel who dwelt in the temple. This part of Melito's invective runs as follows:

"For when the people did not tremble, the earth quaked;
when the people were not terrified, the heavens were terrified;
when the people did not tear their clothes, the angel tore his;
when the people did not lament, the Lord thundered out of Heaven
and the Highest gave voice."³¹

The Greek of the third line is τοῦ λαοῦ μὴ περιεσχισμένου περιεσχίσατο ὁ ἄγγελος. Ms B (Pap. Bodmer XIII) has a plural περιεσχίσθησαν ἄγγελοι, but this must be regarded as a *lectio facilior*. Melito does not speak about angels (in heaven) in general nor about a number of inhabitants of the temple (like Eusebius) but about one particular angel.³² This is now borne out by New Fragment II: here the Georgian has the plural "and angels horrified quit the temple and seraphim cried out with their noise, (The veil) was torn ...",³³ but the Greek text which M. Richard took from Ps Chrysostom, *In ascensionem hom. III* (MPG 52,791) reads ἄγγελος ἐξήλατο τεταραγμένος τοῦ ναοῦ, περιεσχισμένου τοῦ καταπετάσματος τοῦ οἴκου...³⁴

There are further variations on this theme, as C. Bonner³⁵ and M. Richard have pointed out. A Syriac *Sermo de anima et corpore deque passione Domini* attributed to Alexander of Alexandria has: "An angel came forth in trouble from the temple and rent in twain the curtain of the temple";³⁶ a Coptic homily attributed to Athanasius expands the story, introducing an angel who comes forth from among all the angels threatening to kill the Jews; when this is prevented by the mercy of Christ, he lays his hand on the curtain of the

²⁹ Ed. J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu* I-II (S.C. 254 and 258), Paris 1978-9.

³⁰ Ed. A. Zingerle, *C.S.E.L.* XXII, p.188.

³¹ Transl. S. G. Hall (see n.8).

³² M. Testuz in his edition *Papyrus Bodmer XIII*, Genève 1960 regards the plural as original; he is followed by J. Blank, *Meliton von Sardes, Vom Passa*, Freiburg 1963. O. Perler, *Meliton de Sardes, Sur la Pâque* (S.C. 123), Paris 1966 and S. G. Hall rightly prefer the singular.

³³ So S. G. Hall's translation following M. van Esbroeck, "Nouveaux Fragments de Méliton de Sardes", *Analecta Bollandiana* 90(1972)63-99.

³⁴ See this article mentioned in n.9 and Hall's apparatus on p.90 of his edition. In *On Pascha* 17 we should note ὁ ἄγγελος who clothes the mourning Pharaoh not with a grey garment or a torn robe "but with all Egypt torn, grieving for her firstborn". In §.20 the same angel is called ὁ τῆς οἰκαλουμένης ἄγγελος.

³⁵ In his article mentioned in n.2, pp.182ff.

³⁶ See E. A. W. Budge, *Coptic Homilies in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London 1910, p.422.

temple and rends it in twain, from top to bottom.³⁷ A more sober version is found in Ps Cyprianus, *Adversus Iudaeos* 4: "Commota est omnis nativitas in Domini passione, populus mansit immobilis sine trepidatione. Angelus in paenitentiam conscisso velamine refugit, plebs autem sine pavore integra veste permansit."³⁸ We could take "in paenitentiam" very strictly as referring to the angel's repentance for what he had done to Christ, but in view of the contrast to Israel's immobility and lack of compassion the angel's action is more likely to be seen as setting an example of true contrition.³⁹

It is interesting to note that Origen who generally interprets the rending of the temple-veil in terms of revelation and the beginning of a new dispensation⁴⁰ seems to know the tradition of a mourning angel (or temple). In fragment 560⁴¹ we read ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα ὅλον, ἵνα οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἴδωσι τὰ ἅγια ἀπεροῦχ ἐώρων τῇ τοῦ γραμματος παχύτητι ἐμποδίζόμενοι· ἢ καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ θανάτου καὶ πένθους ὅπου περισχίζονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι.

Next, we may mention a number of cases where the veil is described as the garment of the personified temple. In *Ps Clem. Recogn.* I,41,3 we find yet another description of the commotion in the cosmos in connection with Jesus' death (following Mt 27,51-3) in which it is said: "Velum templi scissum est velut

³⁷ See E. A. W. Budge, *op. cit.*, p.271. For further details and secondary literature see also M. de Jonge, *Ned. Theol. Tijdschrift* 21, p.260, note 4.

³⁸ Ed. G. F. Diercks, C.C.L. IV, Turnhout 1972. This tractate is usually dated around the middle of the third century. "Nativitas" = "mankind", "generation of men" (γενεά) see A. Blaise - H. Chirac, *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs chrétiens*, Turnhout 1954, s.v. no.4.

³⁹ The strict interpretation could find some support in two remarkable texts which introduce the figure of a demiurge. In Eznik of Kolb, *De Deo* §.358 (see ed. L. Mariès and Ch. Mercier, *PO*, XXXVIII, 3-4, Paris 1959, pp.516 and 664) we read: "Et quand il (le Dieu de la Loi) l'eut hissé en croix, disent-ils, il (le fils du bon Dieu) descendit aux Enfers, et vides les rendit. Et une fois qu'il eut tiré les âmes de leur sein, il (les) conduisit dans le troisième ciel à son père. Sur ce le Seigneur des créatures prit feu et flamme; de colère, il déchira sa robe et le voile du temple; et il enténébra son soleil; et il revêtit de noir son mode; et il s'assit en deuil, du chagrin qu'il avait." This picture could well go back to Marcion himself (see also M. de Jonge, *Ned. Theol. Tijdschrift* 21, pp.263f.); in any case there is an interesting parallel in *The Second Treatise of the Great Seth* (N.H.L. VII 2), 58, 20-33. "The sun of the powers of the archons set, darkness took them. And the world became poor when he was restrained with a multitude of fetters. They nailed him to the tree, and they fixed him with four nails of brass. The veil of the temple he tore with his hand. It was a trembling which seized the chaos of the earth, for the souls which were in the sleep below were released. And they arose ..." (trsl. R. A. Bullard, in J. M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, Leiden 1977, p.333). According to Louis Painchaud, *Le deuxième traité du Grand Seth* (Bibl. Copt. de Nag Hammadi, Section Textes 6), Québec 1982, p.115: "C'est l'Archonte lui-même qui déchire le voile de son Temple, indignant par là la fin de la servitude sous la Loi inaugurée par le déluge." There are, however, also allusions to other interpretations in this passage, and elsewhere in this tractate. A separate study of this topic would be very useful. (For his help with the interpretation of the Second Treatise of the Great Seth the present author wants to thank his colleague Dr. B. A. G. M. Dehandschutter.)

⁴⁰ See, especially, his Commentary on Matthew 27,51-53 in the edition of E. Klostermann, E. Benz and U. Treu, *Origenes Matthäuserklärung II* (G.C.S. Origenes Werke XI), Berlin 1976, §§.138-9, pp.284-9.

⁴¹ In the edition of E. Klostermann and E. Benz, *Origenes Matthäuserklärung III* (G.C.S. Origenes Werke XII), Leipzig 1941.

lamentans excidium loco imminens".⁴² (Ps?) Hippolytus, *Εἰς τὸ ἄγιον πᾶσχα* explains that the curtain of the temple was rent, *συνπᾶσχον καὶ μηνύον τὸν οὐράνιον ἀληθῶς ἀρχιερέα*.⁴³

Cyril of Alexandria⁴⁴ speaks about the sorrow of the temple over the crucifixion of the Lord of the temple. He adds an interesting detail *ἔθος γὰρ ἦν Ἰουδαίοις τὴν ἐσθῆτα περιιρήγνυσθαι βλασφημηθέντος θεοῦ*, clearly referring to the example of the highpriest at the trial, as his comment in *In Joannis Evangelium Lib. XII* (MPG 74, 676) shows.⁴⁵ Joh. Chrysostom, *De Coemeterio et Cruce* (MPG 49,397) remarks that 'the veil of the temple was rent because the temple could not bear to see the crucifixion of the Lord: διὰ τοῦτο περιεσχίσατο ὁ ναός, τὴν ἐρήμωσιν προδηλῶν τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσομένην διηνεκῶς.

Proclus, in his sermons, also refers to the same theme. In *Oratio* 11 (MPG 65, 785B) he mentions the temple's sorrow;⁴⁶ in *Oratio* 13 (MPG 65, 793C-D) he stages a dialogue with the temple which declares that it could not bear the outrageous deed against the God who had been worshipped in it all along, *διόπερ μὴ φέρων τὴν τόλμαν διέρρηξα τὴν ἐσθῆτα* ...⁴⁷

Finally there is Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* V, 270-5 which represents the temple as a boy in tears who uncovers his chest (*Saucia discisso nudavit pectora velo*).⁴⁸

Among all these variants there is only one possible parallel to T.L. 10,3. According to P. Poussines, the first to publish a collection of fragments from the catenae on Matthew, Chrysostom, in commenting on Mt. 27,50-3 remarked ... *δεικνύντος τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι βεβηλωθήσεται πάντα τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων μυστήρια, καὶ τὸ αἷσχος αὐτῶν φανερόν γενήσεται πᾶσι*.⁴⁹

R. Devreesse denies that the "Chrysostom" fragments published by Poussines are genuine.⁵⁰ Moreover, the difference between the respective contexts

⁴² Ed. B. Rehm - F. Paschke, *Die Pseudoklementinen II, Rekognitionen* (G.C.S. 51), Berlin 1965.

⁴³ Ed. P. Nautin, *Homélies Pascales* I, (S.C. 27), Paris 1950, p.183. Author and date are disputed.

⁴⁴ Fragment 315 on Mt. 27,51 in J. Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche* (T.U. 61), Berlin 1957.

⁴⁵ Compare also Ephraim Syrus, *Comm. on the Diatessaron* XXI 4, referred to above.

⁴⁶ In *Oratio* 12 (MPG 788D-789A) he specifies: *ὁ ναὸς ἐθρήνησε τοὺς χριστοκτόνους*.

⁴⁷ Interestingly, the author reproaches the temple for not mourning when Zechariah's blood was shed (cf. Mt. 23,35). *Protev. Jacobi* 24,3, however, which identifies this Zechariah with the father of John the Baptist, describes the mourning of the temple and the priests who discover the murder with the words *τὰ παθνώματα (= φαινώματα) τοῦ ναοῦ ὠλοῦζαν, καὶ αὐτοὶ περιεσχίσαντο ἐπάνωθεν ἕως κάτω* (see ed. E. de Strycker, S.J., *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques*, Bruxelles 1961). The first clause "the panels of the temple wailed" is derived from Am 8,3 (LXX).

⁴⁸ Ed. I. Huemer, C.S.E.L. X, p.134.

⁴⁹ See Petrus Possinus, *Symbolarum in Matthaeum, Tomus Prior exhibens Catenam Graecorum Patrum unius et viginti* ..., Tolosae MDCXLVI, p.376.

⁵⁰ See R. Devreesse, "Chânes exégétiques grecques", *D.B.S.* I, 1084-1233, esp. 1172. He connects the comments ascribed to Chrysostom with those connected with Theophylactus (11th century!) "Théophylacte serait donc un épitoméur du pseudo-Chrysostome". This makes it difficult to locate and date the comment which interests us.

renders it doubtful that Ps Chrysostom and the Testaments really refer to the "dishonour" in the same way.

4. Concluding remarks

It is striking that we find many parallels to T.B. 9,4 but no statement directly corresponding to T.L. 10,3. In view of the great variety of interpretations of the incident of the temple-veil, this means no more than that T.L. 10,3 represents an individual specimen in a wide spectrum of variations on the theme of the curtain as garment of an angel or the personified temple.

The material analysed in the previous section is found in graphic descriptions of the passion, mainly occurring in homilies, and in exegetical works. The interpretation of this theme in the gospels clearly stirred the imagination of many; the version found in Matthew was particularly popular because of the many features which could be commented upon. Orators and authors could indulge in personal variations on a number of well-known themes and, no doubt, their audience could appreciate their ingenuity. Sermons on this topic called for virtuosity rather than for theological finesse.

We may speak here of "popular" theology in the form of narrative, introducing a personified temple or describing God's presence in the temple as an angel or the divine Spirit. These themes could be connected with or survive alongside more systematic statements concerning christology and soteriology in the context of theories on the history of salvation. A more detailed analysis of the contexts in which these statements occur would reveal an even greater variation than already noted.

Many of the passages which we studied may be called anti-Jewish. This qualification does not apply to the two passages in the Testaments. T.L. 10 speaks about the grave sins of the sons of Levi, not of the Jews in general, and T.B. 9 speaking about the Spirit of God which left the temple in order to be poured out over the Gentiles, is followed by the author's final appeal in chapter 10 to follow the examples of the pre-Mosaic patriarchs and to obey the commandments of the Lord. Chapter 10 ends with the promise in v.11: "But you, if you walk in holiness before the face of the Lord, you will again dwell safely with me, and all Israel will be gathered unto the Lord."⁵¹

In his *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*⁵² Jean Daniélou calls the type of theology under discussion Jewish-Christian in a general sense: "Une forme de pensée chrétienne qui n'implique pas de lien avec la communauté juive, mais qui s'exprime dans des cadres empruntés au judaïsme." Among his many examples are T.B. 9,4 and T.L. 10,3 presupposing the figure of the guardian

⁵¹ See M. de Jonge, "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus" in: *Vig.Chr.* 39(1985)157-170 and "The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" (already mentioned in n.13).

⁵² Tournai 1958. The following quotation found on p.19.

angel of the temple also found in the texts of Josephus and Tacitus mentioned above. Here a Jewish-Christian way of thinking used Jewish categories and christianised them.⁵³

Elsewhere, in a discussion about the place of the Testaments in Jewish Christianity,⁵⁴ Daniélou goes even further: the texts under discussion should be connected with the statements of Josephus and Tacitus; and because they do not yet display the more elaborate rhetorical form in Melito's *On Pascha* the Testaments need not be very far removed in time from Josephus' report on the fall of the Jerusalem temple.

Here, Daniélou certainly goes beyond the evidence; moreover, he bases his conclusions on considerably less material than that which has been presented here. The corresponding texts collected here do not help us to assign a precise date to the Testaments. They prove Daniélou's own thesis that the so-called Jewish-Christian theology, though particularly influential in the first two centuries, remained important in later times and is found in Christian authors of diverse provenance.

The Testaments, incorporating many haggadic elements taken over from Jewish written and oral tradition, were composed with a clearly parenetic purpose in an effort to show that Christianity taught the essential commandments of God which had been valid in the time of the patriarchs.⁵⁵ They wanted to exhort and convince people, Jews and non-Jews alike, and therefore used popular ethical and theological arguments. Our analysis of the two interpretations of the rending of the curtain of the temple which are found in the Testaments has shown that a popular theme could be used and varied effectively. In view of the provenance of other traditions in the Testaments there is no objection to calling this treatment Jewish-Christian in the sense accorded to the term by Daniélou.

⁵³ *Op. cit.*, pp.196-8.

⁵⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp.23-5.

⁵⁵ See, again, M. de Jonge, "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God ..." mentioned in n.51.

Summary

This article deals with a number of interpretations of the incident of the rending of the temple-veil at Jesus' death on the cross which are found in early Christian writings. They are compared to the interpretations found in T. Benj. 9,4 and T. Levi 10,3 in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The interpretations, in general, present themselves as variations on a number of related themes rather than as stages in the development of some leading ideas. T. Benj. 9,4 connects the rending of the veil with the departure of the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles. Parallels speak of the departure of the Spirit or of the departure of the Angel who dwells in the temple. The Divine Presence is no longer connected with the temple, Jerusalem and the Jewish people. T.L. 10,3 speaks of "the garment of the temple", a metaphor that is found in a number of parallels, who connect the garment with the temple as well as with the indwelling angel. On the meaning of the incident the texts differ. There is no direct equivalent of the idea in T. Levi that God rent the garment in order to expose the shame of the Jerusalem priesthood.

In the last section of this essay the author argues that these interpretations are found in graphic descriptions of the passion, mainly in homilies and in exegetical works. They represent "popular theology" in the form of a narrative. If we call it "Jewish-Christian" the term must be taken in the sense of Jean Daniélou's *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*.

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS: CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH

A hundred years after Friedrich Schnapp

1. Introduction

This article appears at the end of a six-year period of renewed intensive occupation with the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs following on the publication of a new critical edition of the Greek text of this document in 1978¹. In this period H. W. Hollander and the present author prepared *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary* (SVTP 8), Leiden 1985, incorporating the results of earlier and recent research on the subject. The present paper attempts to explain these results concentrating on a few main issues. In particular, it will deal with the problem whether the Testaments are Jewish or Christian – a question hotly debated during the past hundred years.

2. Jewish or Christian?

The publication of F. Schnapp's dissertation *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen untersucht*, Halle 1884, is generally considered as a turning-point in the history of the research on the Testaments². After a long period in which the Testaments were regarded as Christian, and in which scholars discussed whether they belonged to Jewish or Gentile Christianity³, this scholar (who later contributed the section on the Testaments to E. Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments II*, Tübingen 1900) returned to the thesis of J. E. Grabe, the first editor of the Greek text of the Testaments (1698), that the Testaments were originally Jewish, but had been interpolated by a Christian.

Schnapp's approach was followed by many others. The Testaments gained their place among the Jewish pseudepigrapha, and until today they are presented as Jewish documents with Christian interpolations in such representative collections as *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (see Band III 1, Gütersloh 1980, by J. Becker) and *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha I*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Garden City, New York 1983; see pp 775-828 by H. C. Kee).

1 M. de Jonge, H. W. Hollander, H. J. de Jonge and Th. Korteweg, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PsVTG 1. 2), Leiden 1978.

2 See J. Becker's section 'Zur Forschungsgeschichte' on pp 129-58 of his *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (AGJU 8), Leiden 1970, and H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (SBL Monograph Series 21), Missoula 1977, chapter III. On Slingerland's survey which ends in 1973 see my review in *JSJ* 9 (1978), pp 167-71.

3 See H. D. Slingerland, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-15, '1810 through 1883: Is the Testaments a Jewish-Christian or a Gentile-Christian Document?'

4 *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches. I: Interprétation des textes*, Uppsala 1977 and *II Composition de l'ouvrage, textes et traductions*, Uppsala 1982; see my reviews in *JSJ* 10 (1979) pp 100-102 and 14 (1983), pp 70-80.

Schnapp's literary criticism did not stop at the removal of Christian interpolations; he also tried to prove that the original Testaments concentrated on moral exhortation and that Jewish apocalyptic materials were added only later. Other scholars after him have come to different results; but, again, all agree on the point that the Testaments are not a unity even without the later Christian additions. There is no need to go into details here after the surveys of research given by J. Becker and H. Dixon Slingerland. Recently, A. Hultgård, in his two massive volumes on the eschatology of the Testaments (published in 1977 and 1982), has presented a picture of various stages of redaction as the outcome of a very complicated development of traditions⁴. He, too, regards the Testaments as a Jewish document and, like his predecessors, he concentrates on the Jewish stages in the origin of the document.

The main dissenter in the past period has been the present author who, in his dissertation *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*, Assen 1953 (²1975), defended the theory that the Testaments were a Christian document of about 200 A.D. for the compilation of which many Jewish elements were used. A few years later⁵ he modified his theory somewhat, not only admitting the probability of a somewhat earlier date, but also stating: 'It is quite conceivable that the Christian author(s) was (were) only the last of a series of collectors and redactors of Testament material, which was transmitted in writing as well as orally, gradually grew in size during the ages, and was adapted to various needs'. Then, as later⁶, he continued to emphasize, however, that the Jewish and patently Christian elements are connected so closely that they cannot be separated by literary critical means. It is impossible to bracket or to cut out a number of Christian phrases (apart from the fact that it is not easy to delimitate them, as the history of recent scholarship shows) and regard the remaining text as a witness to Jewish beliefs in the period before the beginning of the common era.

Again, it is not necessary to review the discussion on the Testaments during the twenty-five years following the publication of my dissertation⁷. In the following sections I simply try to sketch what has become clearer in the years after 1978 and is worthwhile to be summarized for the benefit of future research on the Testaments and other pseudepigrapha.

3. Some fundamental considerations

Early in 1979 I wrote an article for *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Part II, Vol 20, with the title 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central

5 In 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament' in *Studia Evangelica* (TU 73), Berlin 1959, pp 546-56. The quotation below is from p. 550.

6 See, especially, 'Christian influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', *NT* 4 (1960), pp 182-235, now in M. de Jonge (ed), *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation* (SVTP 3), Leiden 1975, chapter XIV.

7 See H. Dixon Slingerland, *op. cit.*, chapters V-VI.

Problems and Essential Viewpoints'. An invitation to read a paper at the S.N.T.S. Meeting at Durham, England in August of that year provided an opportunity to present the main results of this article to the scholarly world in a somewhat more pointed manner. As this article and the subsequent paper⁸ represented the starting-point of later research, carried out personally and jointly with H. W. Hollander during the preparation of the commentary mentioned in the introduction, it is necessary to take up a number of fundamental considerations mentioned there and to carry them a little further.

a. The oldest attainable text, reconstructed with the help of textual criticism is Byzantine. It is difficult to determine the exact date of the archetype of the present textual tradition; it is probably older than the ninth century but we do not know for certain how much earlier it should be dated. Next, there is a quotation from the Testaments in Origen's Homilies on Joshua 15, 16, but for obvious reasons we know very little of the form of the text known to him. Many changes may have taken place in the period between this text used by Origen and the moment the archetype of our textual witnesses originated. Only in very few cases (e.g. T.D. 7,3!) are we able to detect later interpolations with any degree of certainty.

b. It is clear that textual criticism cannot help us to detect an earlier pre-Christian form of text⁹. It is wrong on principle to introduce square-brackets into a critical edition of the Greek text of the Testaments in order to set apart Christian elements, as R. H. Charles did. The only way to achieve any results at all is literary criticism. This applies to efforts to separate between Christian and Jewish forms of the Testaments, as well as to attempts to distinguish separate stages in the history of the supposed Jewish document. And in doing so we cannot be certain that the last Christian redaction was of less consequence than one or more earlier Jewish ones. It is to be regretted that, ever since literary critical operations started, all attention was focussed on earlier forms of text, and that the question was never asked, how the final form of text (the one which lies before us!) ever made sense.

Literary criticism is a limited tool serving a limited purpose. Its criteria for separation are unevennesses, doublets, sudden transitions as to form and content, in short: all signs of inconsistency. But it is not a priori certain that modern standards of consistency are applicable to texts like the Testaments. As I wrote before: 'Literary seams (of all sorts) may be signs of compilation as much as of anything else. At the moment an author (authors) decided to put together admonitions, exemplary stories about the sons of Jacob and predictions concerning the future within the framework of a collection of twelve testaments this process of compilation necessarily implied the use of material that varied in form

8 'The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', published in *NTS* 26 (1979-80), pp 508-524.

9 See also my criticism of J. Becker's views on the matter in 'Textual criticism and the analysis of the composition of the Testament of Zebulun' in *Studies* (see n. 6), pp. 144-60, especially pp 153-60; and my review of A. Hultgård's second volume in *JSJ* 14 (1983), pp 70-80, especially pp 71-75.

or content. However neatly it was put together, some sutures were bound to remain'.¹⁰

Literary criticism may lead to more acceptable results if outside parallel material is available. There are interesting Aramaic and Greek fragments from the Cairo Genizah, Qumran, and Ms Athos, Koutloumous 39, on the basis of which we may assume the existence of a document telling about Levi's life, visions and calling to the priesthood, and running parallel to the *Vorlage* used for the Greek Testament of Levi (which differs considerably from the other testaments in form and content). Yet there are so many differences that it is impossible to suppose any direct literary dependence of the Greek Testaments on the Aramaic document or any immediate ancestor or descendant of it¹¹. At one time, when new Levi-fragments were discovered among the 1Q- and 4Q-material¹² scholars expected the riddle of the Testaments to be solved. We are now in a position to say that the new finds at Qumran have not brought any significant change. New and old parallel material may help us, of course, to get a clearer picture of the redactional activity on the basis of earlier tradition¹³, but no more.

c. Another important consideration to be borne in mind is that we have to be careful in using the 'labels' Jewish and Christian. The Testaments give, for instance, much biographical material, partly taken directly from the Old Testament and partly known to us from haggadic traditions. We may call this 'Jewish' material, but it is clear that the use of it does not mean that the Testaments are Jewish; nor does it prove that there must have been an earlier distinctively Jewish stage in the history of the document.

This is even clearer in the case of the parenetical passages which form the core of the book. In his dissertation *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (SVTP 6), Leiden 1981 Harm W. Hollander has shown convincingly that the ethics of the Testaments were deeply influenced by the Wisdom literature of the LXX and Hellenistic thought. Many of the themes are also found in early Christian exhortations, and in exceptional cases the best parallels are found just there. But, generally speaking, there is very little distinctively Jewish or Christian in the parenesis of the Testaments¹⁴.

The biographical examples serve to illustrate the exhortations which form the

10 'The Main Issues' (see n. 8), p. 517. See also the remarks on form criticism on the same page.

11 For further details, see H. W. Hollander - M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, INTRODUCTION 3.1; 3.3 and 3.4.

12 For a survey of non-Levi material connected with the Testaments collected by J. T. Milik see H. W. Hollander - M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, INTRODUCTION 3.2. Important is a Hebrew fragment containing Bilhah's genealogy in a much larger form than the one found in T.N. 1,6-12. J. T. Milik's theories about other fragments are often extremely hypothetical.

13 The same applies to the parallels to T.N. 5-6 in the Hebrew Testament of Naphtali and the midrashic material which helps to elucidate the accounts about the wars of Judah and his brothers in T. Jud 3-7 and T. Jud 9. See H. W. Hollander - M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, INTRODUCTION 3.5 and 3.6.

14 Recently, John J. Collins, in his *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, New York 1983 has discussed the Testaments in his fourth chapter, entitled 'The Common Ethic'. At the end of the section devoted to the Testaments he writes: 'The ethical teaching is safely

spiritual legacy handed down by the patriarchs to their descendants. The passages dealing with the future announce what the sons of the patriarch will do and what will befall them. There is a great variety in these predictions, and precisely here many distinctively Christian elements are found, usually in strategic places. Very often there is an element of warning, stressing the importance of the exhortations, and there is always a promise of final peace and salvation. The answer to the question: 'Are the Testaments Jewish or Christian?' is directly connected with the result of the analysis of the complex and variegated passages dealing with the future.

4. *The Testaments as a Christian document*

The considerations formulated in the preceding section challenge the student of the Testaments to attempt to interpret the Testaments in their present, final form as a Christian document. In whatever form and in which historical context they may have existed before, they received (more or less) their present form in early Christianity in the latter half of the second century of the common era and must have made such an impact that they were handed down to later generations. This approach was chosen by H. W. Hollander and the present author for their commentary on the Testaments. Concretely, this has meant demonstrating the coherence (and occasional lack of coherence) of the individual testaments, to identify place and function of traditional material in its present context and to clarify the meaning and background of the vocabulary. In practice, it has also led to a persistent search for early Christian parallels, particularly for expressions found in the passages dealing with the future, of which there proved to be surprisingly many.

Only if the Testaments are allowed to say all they have to say and may have conveyed to their early Christian readers, and if our interpretation is not restricted to what 90% (or so) of their text may have meant in a (Hellenistic-) Jewish context, may we claim to have understood them adequately. Some interesting results of this new and fuller understanding of the Testaments were laid down in a number of articles written by the present author alongside and after the work on the commentary.

a. The exhortations in the Testaments form the spiritual legacy of the dying sons of Jacob; their sons will do well to give heed to their admonitions centering around the two great commandments: to fear God and to love one's neighbour. T.B. 10, the last testamentary passage in the Testaments, brings this out very clearly. The patriarch emphasizes that he only follows the good example of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and that he expects his sons to hand on his legacy to future generations.

within the bounds of Judaism but in itself is scarcely distinctive. It reflects the common tendency in Hellenistic Judaism to concentrate on these teachings which could be endorsed by any enlightened person of the Hellenistic age.' (p. 162.) This is not wrong, but fails to take into account that also later Christian ethics are not very distinctive. The full story of parenesis in the Testaments is more complicated, as will be shown in the next section.

His sons, in fact Israel as a whole, will only have a future if everyone obeys these essential commandments and believes in Jesus Christ, together with the Gentiles. Benjamin gives a picture of the resurrection of the sons of Jacob, together with Enoch, Noah, Shem and Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in which all will share who have believed in the king of heaven who appeared on earth in the form of a man. Israel will be gathered to the Lord, if all walk in holiness before him.

This interesting and central passage has been discussed, with a number of related statements, in an article 'The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus'¹⁵. Justin uses the term 'the patriarchs' rather loosely to denote the 'saints' of the pre-Mosaic period who did not know and could not keep the Mosaic commandments, but were righteous men and women and served God perfectly. In fact, the extra-laws which Moses added to the essential commandments were only meant for Israel and for an intermediary period. With Jesus Christ a new disposition has begun, for Jews and Gentiles. 'And as an eternal and final Law was Christ given to us, and this Disposition is sure, after which there is no law, or ordinance or command' (Dial. 11,2). The Jews, in Justin's view, have no other option than to accept this new dispensation and to acknowledge the new Lawgiver.

In the resurrection which is to come all Gentiles who have repented and believed in Jesus will take part, together with all the patriarchs and the prophets and the righteous men that have been born of Israel (Dial. 26,1). All who will have done 'the things that are universally, and naturally and eternally good' (Dial. 45,4) – in all three periods of God's dealings with mankind – will be saved by Jesus Christ. Justin's views of the pre-Mosaic servants of God (and comparable statements in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* IV, 13-16) make clear how the final exhortations of the twelve sons of Jacob centering around the two great commandments, together with their predictions concerning the future of Israel if it would obey and accept Jesus Christ, could be of great importance to Christians living in the second half of the second century and later.

b. In a second article, entitled 'The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs'¹⁶ I have attempted to detect a consistent view on Israel's final destiny in the many variegated passages in the Testaments which deal with the future. The direct connection between exhortation and prediction is very clear in the passages speaking about the resurrection of the patriarchs (besides T.B. 10,6-10 also T. Jud 25 and T.Z. 10, 1-4; cf. T.S. 6,7; T.L. 18,14). T.Z. 10,2 says clearly that the patriarch will rule over his tribe, at least over those who 'have kept the law of the Lord and the commandments of Zebulun their father'. The sons of Israel will rejoice together with the Gentiles (T. Jud 25; T.B. 10). T.B. 10 shows that for Israel, as for the Gentiles, the reaction towards Jesus Christ is decisive. T. Jud 25 is the sequel of the clearly Christian 'Saviour'-passage T. Jud 24; in the

¹⁵ See *Vig. Chr.* 39 (1985), pp 157-70.

¹⁶ To be published in the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*.

same way T.Z. 10, 1-4 follows on T.Z. 9,8 (in the context of a complicated double Sin-Exile-Return sequence, see below). T.S. 6,7 belongs to the evidently Christian passage 6,5-7 and T.L. 18,14 is part of the Christian 'Saviour'-passage T.L. 18. All passages which speak about a 'Saviour' are clearly universalistic in nature. In T.L. 18,9 the prediction that the Gentiles will be multiplied in knowledge and will be enlightened through the grace of the Lord is contrasted with the ignorance and darkness of Israel, and in T.B. 10,8 and 10 Israel is blamed and convicted because of its denial of Jesus Christ. Yet, the final statements in these chapters are positive. When the resurrected Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will exult with Levi, all the saints will put on joy (T.L. 18,14), and all Israel will be gathered unto the Lord, if it walks in holiness (T.B. 10,11). There is severe criticism of the future behaviour of the sons of Jacob, and of their attitude against Jesus Christ in particular, but even for the sons of Dan, whose leader is Satan himself (T.D. 5,6), there is hope. If they impart to their children the things which they have heard from their father, the Saviour of the Gentiles will receive them (T.D. 6,8f). Dan assures his offspring: 'Depart from all unrighteousness, and cleave to the righteousness of the law of the Lord, and my race will be saved for ever' (T.D. 6,10).

The many Sin-Exile-Return passages which represent an eschatological variant of the deuteronomistic view of history¹⁷ emphasize salvation after punishment for sins. The Testaments urge Israel to repent and to obey the Lord; they are really concerned with its final destiny. Several times the pattern is repeated in the Testaments, and the Sin- as well as the Return-elements are related to Jesus Christ. In T.L. 10; 14-15; 16 a threefold repetition underscores the seriousness of the crimes of the priests against Jesus Christ. Yet, the final R.-passage in 16,5 promises that 'he will again visit (you) and in piety receive you through faith and water'. The repetition of the S.E.R. pattern in T.Z. 9 (-10); T.N. 4 and T.A. 7 serves to show that history repeats itself. Patently Christian elements are found in different places but always are strategically situated. This leads to much variety; but there is a consistent interest in Israel's sharing in God's final salvation after the coming of Jesus Christ.

Finally, a number of Levi-Judah passages (T.L. 7,1-2; T.N. 8,2; T.G. 8,1; T. Jos 19,6; cf. T.L. 2,11; T. Jud 22,2; T.D. 5,10) are to be mentioned here. Again there is a great variety: all passages which connect God's final salvation with the tribes of Levi and Judah refer to Jesus Christ, who is often specifically related to Judah¹⁸. The salvation is meant for Israel and the Gentiles (see, e.g. T. Jud 22,2; T.N. 8,2f). Interestingly, twice the Gentiles are mentioned before Israel (T.S. 7,2; T. Jos 19,6; see also T.N. 4,5; T.B. 3,8b). The author is concerned with the

17 See O. H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten* (W.M.A.N.T. 23), Neukirchen 1967, especially pp 149-153.

18 With regard to the relationship of Jesus Christ with Judah and Levi, there are a number of interesting parallels in Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses'. See M. de Jonge, 'Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses' and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), especially section 4.

problem of Israel's share in the salvation brought about by the universal saviour Jesus Christ. Not the salvation of those outside Israel is a burning question, but the fate of the sons of Israel themselves. Hence the exhortations, the warnings, the predictions of punishment and redemption, directed to the descendants of the twelve patriarchs.

c. The findings of a. and b. support each other. The Testaments appeal to the authority of the patriarchs as God's servants in pre-Mosaic times; they presuppose the authority of the 'Old Testament' in the church. They stress the continuity in God's revelation to mankind, from the pre-Mosaic believers to Jesus Christ and after. Israel's refusal to acknowledge Jesus is mentioned, particularly the sins of Levi's sons, the priests, receive ample attention; but Israel is by no means written off. The warnings and admonitions of the patriarchs are directed to Israel, and, time and again, the predictions concerning the future of Israel end with the assurance that obedient and believing sons of Israel will have a share in God's salvation.

We do not know whether the Testaments were intended to be read by Jews; they are parenetic, certainly not polemic or apologetic. Whether they are also missionary, however, is not certain. We know too little about the circumstances in which the Testaments originated and which they were meant to address. But we may safely say that the Christian groups responsible for the Testaments were genuinely concerned with the present attitude and the future destiny of Israel; they may have expressed this in their contacts with their Jewish brethren, using the general viewpoints of the Testaments in inner-Christian discussion as well as in Christian-Jewish dialogue.

One further remark may be in order. Further comparison of interesting details in the Testaments with close and more remote parallels in a wide variety of early Christian writings yielded interesting results, which were laid down in two further articles¹⁹. Nowhere, however, were there any signs of a clear affinity of the Testaments with ideas which might be considered specifically Jewish-Christian. In the case of the two statements concerning the rending of the temple-veil in T.B. 9,4 and T.L. 10,3 and many related early Christian passages, where one finds 'popular' theology in the form of narrative, introducing a personified temple or describing God's presence in the temple as an angel or the divine Spirit, one could, however, speak of a 'Jewish-Christian' way of thinking, in the sense of Jean Daniélou's 'Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme'²⁰. For Daniélou 'Jewish-Christian' is a very general term, denoting a way of Christian thinking expressing itself in various Jewish categories but without any direct connection or special affinity with Jewish theological and ethical ideas. Taken in this way the term may be used to characterize the climate of thought in which the Testaments originated.

¹⁹ Besides the article on Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses', also 'Two interpretations of the rending of the temple veil in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' (to be published in *Bijdragen*).

²⁰ J. Daniélou S.J., *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*, Tournai 1958; see especially pp 17-21.

5. *Christian and Jewish?*

There is, clearly, more coherence in the present Testaments and consistency with regard to the leading ideas than has commonly been supposed. Variety may be explained by the inclusion of different traditions and, occasionally, the use of sources of some sort. If we look at the way the Testaments combine biographical material with parenesis we must conclude that the author more or less dealt with themes and issues as they came to him. He obviously tried to find a place for as much relevant traditional material as he could lay his hands on.

These considerations do not enable us to solve the question whether the now Christian Testaments ever existed in a Jewish form. We are not able to prove that the Testaments were *composed* in Christian circles in the second half of the second century; they may also be the outcome of a thorough and to a considerable degree consistent redaction of an earlier Jewish writing. But it is extremely difficult to find convincing proof for the existence of such a document, nor are we in a position to determine its contents.

The strongest argument in favour of a Christian redaction of an existing Jewish text remains the great diversity and complexity of the passages dealing with the future. Given the great variety in other places we should not expect great conformity in these passages; we should also take into account that there is great diversity in early Christian christology and eschatology, so that the author could allow, or even strive at, great variety. In an assessment of the astonishing diversity in the Sin-Exile-Return and Levi-Judah passages we should also realize that we deal here with 'forms', patterns of thought and expression which by their very nature may be applied in different ways.

Yet it remains difficult to explain why distinctively Christian elements appear in so many different ways and places, and why there are so many different combinations of S.E.R. and L.J. passages, with one another and with 'Saviour' and Resurrection passages²¹. Finally, it is probable that especially the passages dealing with the future attracted additions in the period between the beginning of the third century and the time of origin of the archetype of the present textual tradition, however difficult it is to detect them.

In all, the present text of the eschatological passages seems to suppose a relatively long process of redaction activity, quite possibly starting with a pre-Christian stage in the history of the Testaments. The stages in this process can no longer be distinguished; not only are we unable to determine what Christian scribes changed or added, we are also not in a position to say anything with certainty about possible developments in Jewish circles.

Not everywhere in the Testaments is Christian redaction so marked as in the passages dealing with the future, but that does not mean that the pre-Christian

21 This is shown in detail in INTRODUCTION § 7 in H. W. Hollander's and M. de Jonge's commentary mentioned in the introduction of this article. Compare also my contribution 'Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' (forthcoming).

text was handed down unaltered. In view of the picture sketched in section 4, we should emphasize that those responsible for the 'Christian Testaments' were firmly convinced that they were transmitting, c.q. bringing out more clearly, what the sons of Jacob had meant to say all the time.

This means that we have to think of the (possible) Christian and Jewish stages in the history of our writing in terms of continuity rather than of discontinuity. This last point may be illustrated with the example of the clearly Christian statement T.B. 3,8²². In this verse Jacob says to Joseph:

- a. 'In you will be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven
- b. concerning the Lamb of God and Saviour of the World,
- c. that a blameless one will be delivered up for lawless men
- d. and a sinless one will die for ungodly men
- e. in the blood of the covenant,
- f. for the salvation of the Gentiles and Israel,
- g. and will destroy Beliar and those who serve him.²³

This passage is clearly Christian. In b. we find two Johannine phrases (John 1, 29,36; 4,42; 1 John 4,14). 'In the blood of the covenant' reminds of Mt 26,28; Mk 14,24 and Hebr 9,20; 10,29; 13,20. The expression 'for the salvation of the Gentiles and Israel' must be Christian. Joseph is here viewed as a type of Christ.

If we look at this statement of Jacob in its context, we find that it occurs in the final parenetic section of the Testaments, T.B. 3-8, which deal with ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ. Chapter 3 describes 'the good and holy man Joseph', chapters 4-8 give a fuller picture of 'the good man', referring to Joseph once again in 5,5²⁴. Joseph is an example for the sons of Benjamin who are admonished to fear the Lord and to love their neighbours (3,1-3). Those who obey these commandments will be protected by God against the attacks of their fellow-men, wild beasts and Beliar, as was Joseph (vv 4-5). There are clear links here with the thanksgiving in T.Jos 3,1-10,4 and 10,5-18,4. The first of these describes Joseph's ὑπομονή and ἀγνεία in his difficulties with the Egyptian woman. In the second story Joseph is portrayed as doing everything he can not to put his brothers to shame. In 10,1-4 (concluding the first story) and in 10,5-6 plus 17,1-18,4 (introduction and conclusion of the second one) the humiliation-exaltation scheme is applied to Joseph, just as in T.B. 4,1; 5,5. T. Jos 17,1-2 emphasizes Joseph's μακροθυμία in hiding his brothers' faults and the rest of this chapter tells what he did after they had come to Egypt and also after Jacob's death. There is a link here with T.S. 4,4 and T.Z. 8,4f which speak about Joseph's ἀμνησικακία, mercy and compassion, and also with v.6 in

22 See my 'Test. Benjamin 3,8 and the picture of Joseph as a good and holy man' (forthcoming).

23 This is a translation from the Greek text printed in M. de Jonge c.s., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PsVTG 1.2), Leiden 1978. The shorter Armenian text is clearly secondary; unfortunately it has played a considerable role in the discussions of the backgrounds of the Christian ideas concerning the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ and distorted the argument.

24 See H. W. Hollander, *Joseph as an Ethical Model* (mentioned above), pp. 65-92.

T.B. 3 where Joseph asks his father to pray for his sons 'that the Lord would not reckon to them whatever they had devised regarding him'.

Jacob does not pray, but, overwhelmed by emotion, utters the words recorded in v.8 which clearly form the climax of this chapter. We might assume that the chapter originally had a different ending in which Jacob's prayer was recorded; and that it was redacted very heavily. This remains pure speculation. The person responsible for this verse (and for this chapter in its present form) must have seen a direct connection between Joseph's attitude as depicted in the Testaments and Jesus Christ. In itself the picture of Joseph is one of 'a good man', representing the Hellenistic Jewish ideal of perfect obedience of the law. But his love for his brothers, his readiness to suffer, in order to save them, and his intercession in view of having God's punishment removed from them, led to the expression of the conviction that he was a type of Jesus Christ. For Christian readers of the Testaments there was continuity between God's faithful servant Joseph and that other obedient child of God: Jesus Christ.

THE TESTAMENT OF LEVI AND “ARAMAIC LEVI”

1. “Aramaic Levi”

At the time the first scrolls from Qumran were being published and studied intensively a number of scholars believed to be able to establish a close link between the author(s) of the Jewish *Grundschrift* of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (= *TXIIPatr*) and the community of Qumran. They came to this conclusion on the basis of parallels in content between the already published documents and the Greek *Testaments* and cherished the hope that soon Aramaic or Hebrew fragments of the original *TXIIPatr* would be discovered among the still unidentified or not yet discovered material.⁽¹⁾

In the end these scholars were disappointed. The fragments 1Q21, 1-60 published by J. T. MILIK in the first volume of *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*⁽²⁾ and the fragments belonging to 4Q213 *TestLevi*^a and 4Q214 *TestLevi*^b published or announced by the same scholar⁽³⁾ clearly had to be assigned to the Levi-document (related to but by no means identical with *T. Levi*) which was already known from the Cambridge and Bodleian Cairo Genizah fragments published by H. L. PASS and J. ARENDZEN⁽⁴⁾ and A. COWLEY and R. H. CHARLES respectively,⁽⁵⁾ and from the two

(1) See H. DIXON SLINGERLAND, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*, Missoula MT 1977, pp. 47-90.

(2) D. BARTHÉLEMY, O.P. and J. T. MILIK, *Qumrán Cave I* (DJD I), Oxford 1955, pp. 87-91.

(3) See *Le Testament de Lévi en araméen. Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrán*, *Revue Biblique* 62 (1955), pp. 398-406; and *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrán Cave 4*, Oxford 1976, pp. 23-24. Cf. also *Revue Biblique* 73 (1966), p. 95, n. 2.

(4) *Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi*, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 12 (1900), pp. 651-661.

(5) *An Early Source of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 19 (1907), pp. 566-580. Appendix III of R. H. CHARLES, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford 1908 gives the text of all Genizah fragments together with those of the Greek fragments to be mentioned presently. On p. 254 there is also a very small Syriac fragment.

additions found in the eleventh-century Greek manuscript Athos, Koutloumous 39 (= MS *e*) of *TXIIPatr* at *T. Levi* 2,3 and 18,2.(6) Although of a very different date, the Qumran fragments and the Genizah fragments partly overlapped and clearly represented the same document. Very interestingly, the two columns of a prayer of Levi partly preserved on the fragment published by MILIK in 1955 found a parallel in the first addition to the Greek MS *e*, of which hitherto no Aramaic counterpart was known. MILIK rightly used the Greek material in his reconstruction of the fragmentary text.

It is to be regretted that the 4Q-fragments of "*Aramaic Levi*" (= *Ar. Levi*) have still to be published in full. At the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense 1976 J. T. MILIK told his audience that he was finishing a volume devoted to the *Testament of Levi*, at the same time announcing the existence of more manuscript material.(7) What is available, either from Qumran or from the Cairo Genizah, has been brought together by J. A. FITZMYER-D. J. HARRINGTON,(8) K. BEYER(9) and J. C. GREENFIELD-M. E. STONE.(10) Until everything that is known is also published all editions, translations and comments have to remain provisional, at least to some degree.

It is clear that the Greek fragments in MS *e* are an important witness for *Ar. Levi*. While not directly translated from the Aramaic fragments known to us, as is evident from the differences between the two groups of fragments where they overlap, they clearly go back to another Aramaic manuscript of *Ar. Levi*.(11) The Greek is of help in the reconstruction and

(6) See now the apparatus on *T. Levi* 2,3 and 18,2 in M. DE JONGE *et alii*, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*, Leiden 1978. Very likely, a small addition in MS *e* to *T. Levi* 5,2, worked into the text, also came from the same source.

(7) See his *Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d'Hénoch à Amram* in M. DELCOR (ed.), *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, Paris-Gembloux/Leuven 1978, pp. 91-106 (especially p. 95).

(8) *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts (Second Century B.C.-Second Century A.D.)*, Rome 1978, pp. 80-91 (most of the 1Q fragments and the 4Q fragment published by MILIK in 1955).

(9) *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, Göttingen 1984, pp. 188-209 (includes the Genizah fragments, and translations of the Greek).

(10) See their *Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza*, *Revue Biblique* 86 (1979), pp. 214-230 (with a list of revised readings based on the study of the manuscripts), followed by their translation of all published material in appendix III of H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*, Leiden 1985. They, too, plan a new edition with translation and commentary. CD IV, 15-19 (Hebrew) refers to a writing of Levi that cannot be identified.

(11) See M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Their Text, Composition and Origin*, Assen 1953 (1975), pp. 129-131.

interpretation of the Aramaic text. We have just mentioned the case of the prayer of Levi and may point to the text of Isaac's priestly instructions to Levi, where the addition in MS *e* to *T. Levi* 18, 2 provides a Greek text corresponding to four missing columns in the Aramaic. Unfortunately, nothing is known about the date at which the Greek translation was made. Nor do we know how the fragments came in the hands of the Greek scribe responsible for MS *e* (or one of his predecessors) and whether he knew more than he inserted. (12)

It is generally accepted that the various Aramaic and Greek fragments go back to one document. This will have contained a prayer and a vision of Levi (comparable to what we find in *T. Levi* 2-5) and a report on the expedition to Shechem (*T. Levi* 6). There is a reference to a second vision (corresponding to that in *T. Levi* 8), and a very extended counterpart of the priestly instructions found in *T. Levi* 9, but no parallel to *T. Levi* 10. The existing fragments contain an equivalent to the autobiographical account in *T. Levi* 11-12 and break off somewhere in a passage singing the praise of Wisdom and the wise man (corresponding to *T. Levi* 13). After that there is only a small fragment that can be compared with *T. Levi* 14, 3-4. (13) Unfortunately, the beginning and the end are missing so that we are not in a position to establish directly the genre of the document represented by all these fragments.

It is worth noting in passing, that the situation with regard to the *Testament of Levi* is different from that regarding other testaments belonging to *TXIIPatr*. Next to nothing has come to light at Qumran that is related to the other sons of Jacob. In 1956 J. T. MILIK announced a Hebrew fragment containing a genealogy of Bilhah in a longer form than that found in *T. Napht* 1, 6-12. In 1976 he published the text of *4QTest. Napht* 1 II 4-5 corresponding to *T. Napht* 1, 12. (14) As Bilhah is called "my mother", Jacob

(12) On this see also H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 18-19. The first insertion in *e* forms a unity: it gives a prayer of Levi with a short introduction. It is added at a place corresponding to the one it may have occupied in the alternative Greek text it will have belonged to. Did the scribe still know the original context? The same applies to the addition at *T. Levi* 5, 2. The third insertion has a proper beginning (corresponding to vs. 11 of the Aramaic fragments and *T. Levi* 9, 1), telling about a journey to Isaac, but breaks off unexpectedly with the birth of Levi's son Merari, while the Aramaic continues. Here the one responsible for the insertion very probably had a fragmentary text before him; he inserted it in an awkward place.

(13) See again H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 19-20 with a reserved reaction on further suppositions about the contents of the Levi-document by MILIK (*The Books of Enoch*, pp. 283f.).

(14) See *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956), p. 407, n. 1 and *The Books of Enoch*, p. 198.

“my father” and Dan “(my) brother”(15) it is reasonable to suppose that the fragment represents part of a story told by Naphtali; but it clearly does not provide definitive proof of the existence of a Hebrew Testament of Naphtali at Qumran.(16) It does explain, however, why the Greek *T. Naphtali* has so much information on what is after all a minor detail.

Even more uncertain is the existence of sources of other testaments. In 1978 MILIK described fragments that may have belonged to Aramaic sources behind the *Testaments of Judah and Joseph*.(17) He also connects 3Q7,6 and 5+3(18) with *T. Jud* 25,1 and *T. Jud* 25,1-2 respectively. Recently, M. BAILLET has (tentatively) added twenty small fragments belonging to 4Q484.(19) In the present writer's view MILIK's reconstructions and his theories about the nature and contents of the Aramaic documents related to these two Greek testaments remain too hypothetical to offer any real evidence of Judah- or Joseph-documents at Qumran related to the Greek testaments.(20)

2. 4QQahat and 4Q'Amram

In 1972 J. T. MILIK published a number of fragments belonging to manuscripts of a document called 4Q'Amram and one belonging to a related document called 4QQahat.(21) Qahat

(15) According to MILIK in his note in *Revue Biblique* 63.

(16) There is no connection between the Hebrew fragment mentioned by MILIK and the medieval *Hebrew Testament of Naphtali* (on this see H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 25-26 and 296-297).

(17) See his *Écrits préesséniens* ..., mentioned in n. 7, pp. 97-102.

(18) Published by M. BAILLET in M. BAILLET, J. T. MILIK and R. DE VAUX, O.P., *Les Petites Grottes de Qumrân (DJD III)*, Oxford 1962, p. 99.

(19) M. BAILLET, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520) (DJD VII)*, Oxford 1982, p. 3.

(20) 4QJu 1a-b, for instance, is connected by MILIK with *T. Jud* 12,11-12. Here a brother of Joseph recounts Joseph's encounter with his brothers in Egypt (cf. *Gen* 44,6-45,12). K. BEYER, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, p. 187 regards Benjamin as the speaker, although he has to admit that the incident is not mentioned in *T. Benjamin* or anywhere else in the *Testaments*. He assigns this fragment to one of the later scrolls of the *Genesis Apocryphon* (p. 186). This too, of necessity, remains hypothetical. It should be noted that J. A. FITZMYER, in a list of Qumran Aramaic texts found on pp. 101-102 of his *A Wandering Aramean. Collected Aramaic Essays*, Missoula MT 1975, mentions 4QTBenj, that is a “Testament of Benjamin(?)” belonging to “STARCKY's lot”. Nothing further seems to be known about this fragment.

(21) 4Q Visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène, *Revue Biblique* 79 (1972), pp. 77-97. See also J. A. FITZMYER-D. J. HARRINGTON, *A Manual of Palestinian*

(Kohath) is a son of Levi and the father of Amram. He is mentioned and exalted in *Ar. Levi* vv. 67-68. Levi saw "that he would have an assembly of all the people and that he would have the highpriesthood. He and his seed will be the beginning (or rule) of kings, a priesthood for Israel". There is a reference here to *Gen* 49, 10 belonging to Jacob's blessing of Judah; Kohath will not only be a high priest but also king.⁽²²⁾ Amram is mentioned in *Ar. Levi* vv. 74-77. He marries his aunt Jochebed, born on the same day as he. The defective v. 76 seems to contain an explanation of his name. STONE and GREENFIELD restore: This one [...] the people from the lo[r]d of Eg[yp]t. Therefore [...] will be [call]ed [...] exalted.⁽²³⁾ Amram and Jochebed are, of course, the parents of Aaron and Moses, but their two sons are not mentioned. V. 81 makes Levi say that he saw his third generation before he died at the age of 137 (figures restored with the help of *T. Levi* 12, 6; 19, 4).

The fragment 4Q^{Qahal} does not mention the name of the speaker, but because he addresses his son 'Amram, and commands his sons and their sons, it is clear that Kohath is meant. Next we read: "and they gave to Levi, my father, and Levi my father [gave] to me [...] all my books in testimony, so that you might be forewarned by them [...]."⁽²⁴⁾ This suggests a succession of instructions (the verb used is the *pa'el* of *qbd*, regularly used in the targums as a translation of *šwh*, see e.g. *Gen* 49, 33) from generation to generation. We may compare here *Ar. Levi* where we find Isaac instructing Levi concerning the priesthood (v. 13). He explicitly refers to Abraham's instructions to him (vv. 22, 50, 57), and once he tells Levi that Abraham instructed him what "he found in the writing of the book of Noah concerning the blood" (v. 57). Of course, Levi will have to hand down Isaac's regulations to his sons, because his offspring will be priests after him (vv. 48-50, cf. 58-61). Next, *Jub* 45, 16 tells that Jacob gave all his books and the books of his fathers to his son Levi, to preserve

Aramaic Texts, pp. 92-97 and K. BEYER, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, pp. 209-214—who adds a very small fragment that J. A. FITZMYER published in transcription in *Theological Studies* 19 (1958), pp. 225-227 (now in his *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, Missoula MT 1974, pp. 101-105) and at that time ascribed to the Amram document. The text speaks about a person (Aaron?) who "will be the seventh among the men of [his] good will [and ho]nour and will be chosen as priest for ever." One should note that MILIK supposes the existence of a Greek version of 4Q^{Amram}, known to early Christian writers.

(22) So GREENFIELD-STONE's translation in H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, p. 466 on the basis of Aramaic and (longer) Greek texts. See also their *Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi*, pp. 223-224.

(23) So *Commentary*, p. 467 and *Remarks*, pp. 225-226.

(24) I follow here the translation of J. A. FITZMYER and D. J. HARRINGTON.

them and to renew them for his children "till today". (25) *Jubilees* generally emphasizes the continuous line of instruction: see *Jub* 7, 38-39: Enoch-Methuselah-Lamech-Noah; 10, 14.17: Noah-Shem; in 21, 10 Abraham instructing Isaac refers to the books of his forefathers (the words of Enoch and the words of Noah).

Fortunately of *4QAmram* the beginning has been preserved: "A copy of a book of words of visions of 'Amram, son of Qahat, son of Levi: Everything [that] he made known to his sons and that he commanded them on the day of [his] death." (26) This year is said to be his 136th year, and the 152nd of Israel's exile in Egypt. Again the verb פָּקַד is used, parallel to the 'aphel of הָוָה meaning "to show, to make known". Again there is a succession in instruction, this time clearly connected with the death of the central figure, as in *TXIIPatr*. We may, therefore, call *4QAmram* a "testament", but should note that the opening words of the document themselves speak about "the words of the visions"—the preserved fragments do indeed contain two visions, just as *Ar. Levi* mentions one vision and looks back upon a second. (27)

From this it is clear that *Ar. Levi*, *4QQahal* and *4QAmram* belong together; they contain instructions (and visions) handed down from generation to generation, in priestly circles; in the case of *Ar. Levi* we are sure that they were concerned with specific priestly matters. The structure of the document to which the Levi-fragments belong, and its exact nature cannot be determined with certainty. (28) It was written in the first person singular and comes to a provisional close in v. 81, where Levi refers to his death. Then, in v. 82, he mentions a speech in the 118th year of his life, the year in which his brother Joseph died. This speech is explicitly presented as an instruction to the sons of Levi (in vv. 82-84 we find twice פָּקַד [and the expression פָּקַדְךָ יָדְךָ 'L] and once

(25) Note the different procedure in *Assumption (Testament) of Moses* 1, 16-18 where Joshua as Moses' successor (as leader of the people and as minister in the tent of testimony—see 1, 6-9) has to take "this writing" in order that he may remember later how to preserve the books that Moses will entrust to him. He has to arrange them, to anoint them with cedar and to deposit them in earthenware jars in a place chosen (by God) from the beginning of the world, so that God's name may be called upon until the consummation of days when God will surely visit his people.

(26) So again FITZMYER-HARRINGTON.

(27) On these aspects of the two writings see especially E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Allen I*, Leiden 1980, pp. 115-118 and A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches II*, Uppsala 1982, pp. 60-62.

(28) See J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*, Leiden 1970, pp. 94-95. D. HAUPT, *Das Testament des Levi* (Diss. Mach. Halle-Saale 1969), pp. 84-86, 90-92) and the section in HULTGÅRD's *L'eschatologie* mentioned in the previous note.

the *haphel* of HWY/HW'), but it has no particular priestly features. It extols truth and wisdom, and Joseph in particular is mentioned as an example; he "taught reading and writing and the teaching of wisdom" (v. 90). What is given in vv. 82ff. (and has also been preserved in an as yet unpublished fragment found at Qumran) seems to have been added later to an already existing document with final instructions and predictions of Levi. It maintains the use of the first person plural, and exhibits a number of "testamentary" features without being a death-bed address. It is uncertain what conclusions can be drawn from this with regard to the missing beginning of the first part of *Ar. Levi*. We shall do wise not to call this part or the entire document a "testament of Levi".(29)

3. Original language, date and provenance of the Levi, Qahat and 'Amram documents

There is something to be said in favour of the theory that *Ar. Levi* goes back to a Hebrew original but it is difficult to achieve absolute certainty.(30) More important is the growing consensus with regard to a preessenian date of these documents. A. HULTGÅRD calls *Ar. Levi* (and *Jubilees*) "zadokite" rather than "essenian". They come from priestly circles around the Jerusalem temple at the end of the third and the beginning of the second century B.C.(31) One of his arguments in MILIK's dating of 4Q'Amram^b in the first half of the second century: this provides a solid *terminus ad quem* of this document which was probably written later than *Ar. Levi* that gives information about a more illustrious priestly ancestor.(32) Michael E. STONE has recently adduced a paleographical argument: he reminds us that 4Q213 *Levi*^a dates from the second century. Moreover, he considers it likely that *Ar. Levi* is a source of *Jubilees*, and regards it as proven

(29) We should also observe that v. 81 as the obvious end of the first part is not a proper ending for a "testament".

(30) So J. C. GREENFIELD-M. E. STONE, *Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi*, p. 228; hesitant A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches I*, Uppsala 1977, p. 30. Older advocates of a Hebrew original are listed by J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen*, p. 73. J. T. MILIK, *Écrits préesséniens*, p. 106 regards Aramaic as the original language of all pseudepigraphic documents discussed in his article; later they were translated into Hebrew. In the case of the Hebrew Naphtali-fragment he remarks that an onomastic misreading allows us to conclude that there was an Aramaic original (p. 97).

(31) *L'eschatologie...* I, pp. 43-45.

(32) *L'eschatologie...* I. p. 29.

that some datings go back to the ancient calendar that is found in *Jubilees* and in the oldest parts of the Enoch cycle, the *Books of the Luminaries* (1 En 72-82) and the *Book of the Watchers* (1 En 1-36). From this he concludes to a third-century date. (33) P. GRELOT, in a recent article, (34) agrees. He, too, assumes dependence of *Jubilees* on *Ar. Levi*, and regards a third-century date of the latter probable. J. T. MILIK advocates a Samaritan origin and composition "in the course of the third century, if not towards the end of the fourth". (35) In the context of the present article these matters cannot be pursued any further. They had to be mentioned in order to remind ourselves that not all writings preserved at Qumran originated in the sect that regarded them important enough to hand them down.

4. Dependence of T. Levi on Ar. Levi

A number of scholars have carried out a more or less detailed comparison between the *Testament of Levi* in *TXIIPatr* and the extant fragments of *Ar. Levi* in order to determine the relationship between the two documents. (36) Most have concluded that there must be some sort of literary dependence on the part of *T. Levi*; J. BECKER, who denies this, assumes that it goes back to a relatively stable oral cycle of narrative material also reflected in and represented by *Ar. Levi*. The problem, as always, is to account for the agreements as well as the divergencies. Many of

(33) See his *Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins*, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* (forthcoming; the author kindly sent me a copy of his manuscript). On the use of the sectarian calendar in *Ar. Levi* vv. 65-72 see J. C. GREENFIELD-M. E. STONE, *Remarks*, pp. 224-225.

(34) *Le Livre des Jubilés et le Testament de Lévi*, in P. CASSETTI, O. KEEL, A. SCHENKER (ed.), *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy*, Fribourg/Göttingen 1981, pp. 109-133. We cannot discuss here the problem of the relationship between *Ar. Levi* and *Jubilees*.

(35) See, especially, his *The Books of Enoch*, p. 24. He emphasizes the close relationship between *Ar. Levi* and the *Book of the Watchers*. In his *Écrits préesséniens*, p. 96 he writes: "Plusieurs indices, en particulier la toponymie réduite à l'horizon de l'ancien royaume d'Israël, prouvent incontestablement, à mon jugement, l'origine samaritaine du Testament de Lévi." Neither his arguments adduced in connection with *Ar. Levi*, nor those given in connection with Judah material on the following pages, are convincing.

(36) See M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Their Text, Composition and Origin*, pp. 38-52 and *Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII* in M. DE JONGE (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation*, Leiden 1975, pp. 247-260; J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte*, pp. 67-105; D. HAUPT, *Das Testament des Levi, passim* and A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches II*, pp. 93-106.

the divergencies may be explained by the redactional activity of those responsible for *T. Levi* as part of a writing consisting of twelve patriarchal testaments. Also additional material outside *Ar. Levi* (like that preserved in *Jubilees*) may have been used, and, finally, it is quite possible that *T. Levi* goes back to an *Ar. Levi* manuscript, different from that represented by the Aramaic fragments and the *Vorlage* of the Greek fragments (which, as we have seen, also show slight differences).

Among the arguments in favour of literary dependence that of the order of events in both documents is of primary importance. If we compare the reconstruction given above with *T. Levi* we find remarkable agreements. To mention a few points: In *Ar. Levi* we find a prayer and a vision. At first sight the prayer (mainly preserved in the Greek) does not seem to agree with *T. Levi* 2, 4 "and I prayed to the Lord that I might be saved", a very short and at the most a very one-sided extract of the prayer contained in *Ar. Levi*. But when, somewhat later in the story, the angel accompanying Levi tells him that the Most High has heard his prayer (*T. Levi* 4, 2ff.), he clearly refers to other elements of the longer prayer (see e.g. verse 2: "...to separate you from unrighteousness and that you should become to him son and a servant and a minister of the presence").(37) We notice here a tendency in *T. Levi* to shorten the underlying text. This is also noticeable in the account of the Shechem episode of which only unconnected fragments, but clearly of a longer story, have been preserved.(38)

Interestingly, also in *Ar. Levi* there must have been an account of two visions, immediately followed by priestly instructions of Isaac for Levi. Here *T. Levi* 9, 6-14 is very much shorter than *Ar. Levi* represented partly by Aramaic (vv. 12-32) and completely by the Greek fragments (continuing to v. 64). Here the longer text is not free from repetitions and may have undergone expansion.(39) Isaac's instructions find a proper conclusion in the

(37) See my *Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII*, p. 254, referring to D. HAUPT, *Das Testament des Levi*, pp. 16-17.

(38) J. C. GREENFIELD and M. E. STONE, *Remarks*, p. 216 and *Commentary*, p. 461 restore lines 17-18 of Cambridge fragment col a to "[I took counsel with] Jacob my father and Reu[ben my brother]", to be compared with *T. Levi* 6,3 which mentions Reuben besides Jacob, a feature not found elsewhere. In Cambridge col b not only Levi, Simeon and Judah, but also Reuben are mentioned explicitly.

(39) D. HAUPT, *Das Testament des Levi*, pp. 74-75, using earlier suggestions of M. DE JONGE and J. BECKER, divides the existing Greek texts into three sections: vv. 13-30, 31-47 (plus concluding passage 48-50), 51-60 (with again an appropriate ending to which v. 61 was added as a later gloss). In any case direct parallels between *T. Levi* and *Ar. Levi* end with the reference to the kind of wood to be used (*T. Levi* 9,12 par *Ar. Levi* v. 25a). In *T. Levi* 9,13-14 the prescript to salt every sacrifice with salt has a parallel in *Ar. Levi* v. 29 (cf. vv. 26, 37), but both texts may go back directly to *Lev* 2,13.

Greek version of *Ar. Levi*, but break off suddenly in *T. Levi*; *Ar. Levi* continues with biographic details for which *T. Levi* 11-12 provide a clear parallel. *T. Levi* 10, to be connected with similar passages in *T. Levi* 14-15, 16 all speaking about the future sins and punishment of Levi's sons, is evidently an insertion into an existing context by the author(s) of *T. Levi*.⁽⁴⁰⁾

Very significant is the transition between *T. Levi* 12 and 13 parallel to that between *Ar. Levi* vs. 81 and 82. Here, as we have seen, the Aramaic continues with a new speech by Levi dated in the year of Joseph's death. *T. Levi*, a proper testament, could not conclude the preceding section with a reference to Levi's death, so it appropriately leaves this out here, to return to it in *T. Levi* 19. It could also not refer the following speech to an earlier date. So what is left are two disconnected remarks in *T. Levi* 12, 6-7, at an unexpected place: "And behold, my children, you are a third generation. Joseph died in (my) hundred and eighteenth year." If anything this handling of a difficult text shows that the author(s) of *T. Levi* had a document very like *Ar. Levi* before him (them). There are considerable differences, however, in the following speech⁽⁴¹⁾ which are difficult to explain. The fragment that is probably parallel to *T. Levi* 14, 3-4 shows that *Ar. Levi* contained a prediction of the sins of the sons of Levi.

T. Levi, then, represents an abbreviated and heavily redacted version of the Levi-material, preserved in the various fragments of *Ar. Levi*. We would welcome more evidence—particularly in the case of the two visions, and with regard to the predictions concerning the future (did *Ar. Levi* have anything parallel to the enigmatic *T. Levi* 17 and the much disputed description of the new priest in *T. Levi* 18?), but it is simply not available. What is available, however, also explains why in the framework of *TXIIPatr* *T. Levi* is so different from the other testaments. On the whole, of course, there is a great variety within the general structure of *TXII Patr* that combines the elements of exhortation, biography and prediction in many ways.⁽⁴²⁾ Also in other cases the presence of related material elsewhere explains special features of a particular testament (see e.g. *T. Judah* and *T. Napht*). *T. Levi*, however, shows by far the most ideosyncracies; these can be adequately explained by the use of an exceptionally rich source of material: *Ar. Levi*.

(40) See my *Levi, the sons of Levi and the Law in Testament Levi X, XIV-XV and XVI* in J. DORÉ, P. GRELOT, M. CARREZ (eds.), *De la Tórah au Messie. Mélanges H. Cazelles*, Tournai 1981, pp. 513-523.

(41) See e.g. the comparison in H. W. HOLLANDER, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Leiden 1981, pp. 57-62.

(42) See E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Alten* I, pp. 12-107.

T. Levi forms, undoubtedly, part of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* conceived and executed as a single, coherent writing, employing material and ideas from various sources and various traditions.⁽⁴³⁾ Comparison between the (again variegated) constitutive elements of the framework of the twelve testaments offers a number of interesting agreements with *Ar. Levi*, *4QQahal* and *4Q'Amram*—which, however, do not necessarily point to literary dependence.⁽⁴⁴⁾ We may mention here the expression “copy of the words of” found in *4Q'Amram* and in *T. Sim* 1, 1; *T. Levi* 1, 1; *T. Jud* 1, 1; *T. Iss* 1, 1; *T. Zab* 1, 1; *T. Dan* 1, 1; *T. Benj* 1, 1;⁽⁴⁵⁾ the frequent use of *enellomai* corresponding to *Ar. pqd* in the Testaments, also at the beginning and the end of a testament (see, e.g., *T. Reub* 1, 1; *T. Sim* 7, 3; 8, 1; *T. Levi* 19, 4; *T. Napht* 9, 1); the mention of the age of the patriarch together with that of the year of Joseph's death (see *Ar. Levi* 81, 82 compared with *T. Reub* 1, 2; *T. Sim* 1, 1; *T. Zab* 1, 1); the “Lehrer-öffnungsformel”⁽⁴⁶⁾ in *Ar. Levi* 83 and similar formulas in *TXIIPatr* (see e.g. *T. Reub* 1, 5; *T. Sim* 2, 1; (*T. Jud* 13, 1); *T. Iss* 1, 1; *T. Zab* 1, 2; *T. Dan* 1, 2; *T. Napht* 1, 5; *T. Ash* 1, 2; *T. Jos* 1, 2). Finally, there is the notion of warning in *4QQahal*, that is also present in a number of statements in *TXIIPatr* in which the patriarchs exhort their offspring to pay heed to their instructions and their predictions, in order to avoid sin and to practice obedience, and to be ready at God's intervention in the future (*T. Sim* 6, 1; 7, 3; *T. Levi* 10, 1-2; *T. Iss* 6, 3; *T. Dan* 6, 9; *T. Napht* 4, 1; 8, 1-2; *T. Gad* 8, 1; *T. Benj* 10, 4-5; and cf. *T. Ash* 7, 4). *TXIIPatr* as a whole view the “Testaments” of the twelve sons of Jacob in the perspective of the spiritual heritage of the patriarchs before them. Not only does *T. Levi* in 9, 6-8 put much emphasis on Isaac's instructions to Levi and preserve the reference to Abraham's instructions to Isaac (9, 12), also in *T. Jos.* 3, 3 Joseph is protected from temptation because he remembers the word of his father Jacob (cf. *Jub* 39, 6-7), prays to the Lord and fasts. Towards the end of the *Testaments*, in *T. Benj* 10, Benjamin's teaching “instead of any inheritance” is compared to

(43) See E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Allen* I, p. 258. The existence of individual testaments ascribed to sons of Jacob remains uncertain. The hypothesis that the collection of twelve testaments is the result of a process of gradual growth is untenable.

(44) On what follows see E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Allen* I, pp. 115-118; A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* II, pp. 60-62.

(45) In *T. Levi* 1, 1 and *T. Benj* 1, 1 (cf. *T. Zab* 1, 1) the verb *dielheto* follows immediately; in *T. Reub* 1, 1; *T. Napht* 1, 1; *T. Gad* 1, 1 and *T. Jos* 1, 1 the expression “copy of the testament (*dialhêkês*)” is used.

(46) On this term see E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Allen* I, p. 93.

that of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as well as (implicitly) to that to Enoch, Noah and Shem (see vv. 4, 6). (47)

5. Consequences for the interpretation of T. Levi

The result reached in the previous section is of limited value for the interpretation of the present *T. Levi* because so many details remain uncertain. After all, we have carried out a comparison between a Greek document that in its present form dates from the second half of the second century A.D. and an Aramaic one of the second half of the third century B.C., and much may have happened in between. Apart from the many difficulties confronting those who want to reconstruct a Jewish *Vorlage* of the Testaments which in any case must have undergone a thorough Christian redaction, (48) there is much uncertainty as to the form of the *Aramaic Levi* tradition which the author of the *Testaments* had at his disposal (Different from that in *Ar. Levi*? With additions from other sources? Already in a Greek form?). One may, of course, try to bridge the gap between *T. Levi* and *Ar. Levi* by putting the composition of *TXIIPatr* in (substantially) their present form early. A. HULTGÅRD, for instances ascribes it to anti-Hasmonean circles in the first half of the first century B.C. (before 63 B.C.), assuming a number of later «rééditions» (including a fairly incisive one when the document was translated into Greek) and a final Christian redaction. (49) Such an approach, however, underestimates the extent of the Christian redaction (if, indeed, we should speak of Christian redaction and not of Christian composition), and assumes too easily the existence of an original Aramaic version of the entire *TXIIPatr*. (50)

(47) See also my *The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus, Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985), pp. 157-170.

(48) See H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 67-85 and M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Christian and Jewish, Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 39 (1985), pp. 265-275.

(49) See his *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* II, pp. 214-238. Compare now also E. SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* III 2 (rev. and ed. by G. VERMES, F. MILLAR and M. GOODMAN), Edinburgh 1987, pp. 767-781, esp. 774f. (remains vague as to details of the history of composition and redaction).

(50) See my review of HULTGÅRD's second book in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 14 (1983), pp. 66-80, esp. pp. 78f., and H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 27-29.

We shall have to admit that very little is known (and can be known) with certainty about the possible intermediate stages between *Ar. Levi* and *T. Levi*.

This may be illustrated by a short analysis of *T. Levi*'s views on the priesthood of Levi and that of his sons, and of its expectation of an ideal priest in the future.(51)

In *Ar. Levi*, Levi is a priest who receives detailed instructions concerning sacrifices (vv. 13-61). According to *e*'s addition at *T. Levi* 5,2 he expiates the sins of the earth as servant of the Lord. Here, in the Prayer of Levi (vv. 6,18) and in the final passages of the priestly instructions (vv. 48-50; 58-61) his seed joins him in his office, and shares in the eternal blessing connected with the priesthood. At the same time all emphasis in the Prayer of Levi is on Levi's holiness, purity, wisdom and knowledge; he prays to be protected against the unrighteous spirit and from fornication and pride. The holy spirit may grant him "counsel and wisdom and strength" (vv. 7-8). Also Isaac's priestly instructions begin with an exhortation to remain holy and to shun sexual impurity (vv. 16-18). Levi's final prayer is: "Make (me) a participant in your words to do true judgment for all time, me and my children for all the generations of the ages" (v. 18); v. 59 in the priestly instructions ends with "blessing will be pronounced by your seed upon the earth". In the appended instructions pronounced by Levi in the year of Joseph's death all emphasis is on reading, writing and teaching of wisdom. Here Joseph is the great example for Levi's children (vv. 82-95).

Ar. Levi (together with the Qahath-and 'Amram-documents) clearly originated in priestly circles which stressed the instructional functions of the priesthood.(52) There is more, however. Levi is a central figure in the events at Shechem; and in Bodleian fragment *a* supplemented by *IQ21*, fragments 1, 3 and 4 his kingdom of the priesthood (to be connected with the greatness—or "anointing"—of eternal peace)(53) is mentioned beside the kingdom of the

(51) For this see also my *Notes on Testament Levi II-VII* (see note 36), *Levi, the sons of Levi and the Law in Testament Levi X, XIV-XV and XVI* (see note 40), *Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?* in J. W. VAN HENTEN c.s. (eds.), *Tradition and Reinterpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*, Leiden 1986, pp. 150-162, as well as the notes on the relevant passages in H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*.

(52) See M. E. STONE, *Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Age* in P. D. MILLER c.s. (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion (Fs. F. M. Cross)*, Philadelphia 1987, pp. 575-586, and earlier, A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches I*, pp. 15-45.

(53) See J. C. GREENFIELD-M. E. STONE, *Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi*, p. 218. Contrast Gersam: "I saw in my dream, that he and his seed will be cast out of the highpriesthood" (v. 64).

sword. We have already noted that Kohath and his offspring will be highpriest *and* king (vv. 67-68). The priestly ideal found here is clearly that of a priest-warrior-king.

Many of the points just mentioned are also found in the Greek *T. Levi*, in the context of instructions, warnings and predictions directed to the sons of all twelve patriarchs. There are also many, essential, differences.

For obvious reasons Levi's priestly function receives much emphasis in the visions recorded in *T. Levi* 2-5 and 8; his offspring shares in his blessing and his duties. In 8,3 we read: "From now on become a priest of the Lord, you and your seed for ever" (cf. 8, 16 and also 8, 17 "from them will be highpriests and judges and scribes"). Among the many gifts that Levi receives in 8, 1-10 are understanding, truth, faith and prophecy and judgement; in 4, 2-3 Levi, separated from unrighteousness (cf. 2, 3-4) is said to be God's "son and a servant and a minister of his presence" who "will light up a bright light of knowledge in Jacob" and "will be as the sun to all the seed of Israel". In this blessing, again, Levi's seed will share—but "until the Lord will visit all the nations in the tender mercy of his son for ever" (4, 4). The same limitation is found in 5, 2(54), and in a difficult passage in 8, 11-15 we hear that a king arising from Judah "will establish a new priesthood after the fashion of the Gentiles for all the Gentiles". He will be "a high prophet from the seed of Abraham our father".

In *TXIIPatr* Levi's central position in Israel is acknowledged; he is exalted as a perfect servant of the Lord. But the time of his priesthood is limited (5, 2); when he declares God's mysteries to man "he will proclaim concerning him who will redeem Israel" (2, 10) and he has to instruct his sons concerning Jesus Christ (4, 5). The ideal new highpriest described in chapter 18 who will also be king and "will light up the light of knowledge as by the sun of the day" is nowhere said to be of Levi's seed (18, 3). But Levi will rejoice when he appears, together with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (18, 4). (55) As to Levi's sons all emphasis is on their future sins against Jesus-Christ, as is clear in 4, 4-6 and the three consecutive Sin-Exile-(Return)-passages in chapter 10, 14-15 and 16, supplemented by another complicated description of the vicissitudes of subsequent generations of priests in chapter 17 ending with another S.E.R.S. sequence in vv. 8-11 (followed by the description of new punishment and the appearance of the new

(54) Cf. *T. Reub* 6, 8 where Levi is said to function as priest, teacher and judge "until the consummation of times (, the times) of the anointed highpriest of whom the Lord spoke".

(55) In *T. Jud* 24, 1 (cf. 22, 2f.) the future king is said to be from Judah.

priest in chapter 18). Levi's sons should function as "the light of heaven, as the sun and the moon" (14,3), but they will be "darkened through ungodliness"—as will become evident when they wish to kill "the light of the law ..., given ... to enlighten every man" (14,4). Their opposition against Jesus Christ (who in 16,2 is described as "a man who renews the law in the power of the Most High") reveals their failure. The temple will be destroyed (15,1; 16,4, cf. 10,3), instructions will be unmasked as "commandments contrary to the ordinances of God" (14,4). Many more sins are mentioned similar to those found in other invectives against priests in Jewish literature; to a great extent they are the sins for which the other sons of Jacob are warned or reproached. But the real purpose of the repeated predictions in the present *T. Levi* is the announcement of the sins of Levi's sons against Jesus Christ and the definitive disqualification of the priesthood as such—for which the patriarch himself is not to be blamed (10,2; cf. 14,2). He tells his sons beforehand what will happen, (56) announces the new priest Jesus Christ and looks forward to rejoicing with the other patriarchs at his appearance.(57)

We should add that *T. Levi* 9 gives only a poor extract of Isaac's priestly instruction to Levi, stressing the warning against *porneia* (cf. *Ar. Levi*!), but introducing already a reference to the sins of Levi's seed (v. 9, cf. chapter 10, etc.). *T. Levi* 13, though in many respects different from its counterpart in *Ar. Levi*, follows it in not speaking about any specific priestly functions. In v. 1 Levi commands his sons "you fear our Lord with your whole heart and walk in simplicity according to all his law", just as, in 19,1, he urges them to choose "either darkness or light, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar"—a choice confronting everyone who wants to serve God in righteousness.

Returning to the description of Levi himself for a moment, we note that also in *T. Levi* he is depicted as a warrior-priest, executing God's judgment on Shechem (5,3-4 following on vv. 1-2; 6,8), acting out of zeal for the Lord, like Phinehas (6,3, cf. *Num* 25). In accordance with this are a number of "royal" attributes given to Levi during his investiture (8, 4.7.9), and the picture of Levi as waging the war of the Lord in future, found in *T. Sim* 5,4-5 (cf. *T. Reub* 6,11-12 clearly Christian in its present

(56) Significantly, *T. Levi* 1,1 stresses the element of prediction in this testament ("...according to all they would do and that would befall them until the day of judgment").

(57) In all likelihood Levi is "the first who is anointed to the priesthood" who is extolled in 17,2. We should note that many of the expressions used here suggest that this first anointed priest is regarded as a type of Christ.

form (58)). In *T. Levi* itself, however, the one "who will redeem Israel" to be announced by Levi (2, 10) will come from Levi and Judah (v. 11)—in accordance with the view found in many other passages in *TXIIPatr.* (59) We should note that, contrary to what is said in the account in *Ar. Levi*, Levi goes to Isaac with his brother Judah (9, 1), who in his own testament (*T. Jud* 17, 5) records: "Abraham my father's father blessed me, to be king over Israel; and Isaac blessed me in like manner." This is in accordance with *Jub* 31 (see especially vv. 5-11 and vv. 18-20) and represents, therefore, a parallel ancient tradition.

The tribes of Levi and Judah occupy an important place in Israel according to *TXIIPatr.* Therefore, in *T. Levi* many things could be taken over from *Ar. Levi*; this testament extols its patriarch as priest, teacher of the law, judge and leader. In the conflict with Shechem he acts out of his zeal for the law of the Lord. Levi's sons were destined to follow in their father's footsteps. Alas, when Jesus Christ came, as a new priest not from the tribe of Levi, as the true leader of Israel and the nations and, indeed, as a "renewer of the law", they rejected him, just as their father had foretold.

The present *T. Levi* is thoroughly Christian, but at the same time it acknowledges the special position of Levi and his tribe, the sacrificial cult (though it pays very little attention to it) and the temple in Jerusalem in the time before the arrival of Jesus Christ. It sees clear parallels between Levi and Jesus Christ, but does not establish a link between the new priest and the tribe of Levi, and at one place it connects Israel's redeemer who is, in fact, the one who will save "the whole race of men" (2, 11) with Levi and Judah. A. HULTGÅRD has posited two editorial stages between *Ar. Levi* and the present Christian document, one looking out for an ideal priesthood and Davidic kingship (and even expecting a Davidic Messiah at some places), and one expecting a (nearly) angelic saviour priest as messianic figure. (60) The exact delineation of these intermediate stages, here and elsewhere, is a hazardous undertaking, and it is by no means certain that they ever existed.

(58) Cf. *T. Reub* 6, 7-8.

(59) On this see my *Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?* (see note 50), *passim*.

(60) See also his *The Ideal 'Levite', the Davidic Messiah, and the Saviour Priest in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, in J. J. COLLINS and G. W. E. NICKELSBURG (eds.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms*, Chico 1980, pp. 93-110.

6. Levi and the Law. T. Levi 19

As we have seen, Levi's commandments to his sons in chapter 13 are of a very general nature. They have to live righteously and to acquire true wisdom, studying the law of God unceasingly. Observing this they will be honoured; and, like Joseph, they will be at home even in a strange country. The descriptions of the future sins of Levi's offspring are of a general nature too; they represent a specific priestly variant of enumerations of similar sins elsewhere.⁽⁶¹⁾ The principal sin is the opposition against Jesus Christ as "one who renews the law in the power of the Most High" (*T. Levi* 16, 3), the one who is "the light of the law ... for every man" (14, 4). The exhortations in *TXIIPatr* (like those in Wisdom literature) generally bring out what those who observe God's law have in common with other human beings who want to live responsibly.⁽⁶²⁾ Elsewhere I have pointed out that also JUSTIN and IRENAEUS speak about the essentials of God's law in general, Hellenistic-Jewish terms and that they see the Law of Moses as an extra legislation for Israel only; they regard Jesus as one who anew brings out what really matters in man's relation with God and with his neighbour.⁽⁶³⁾

We may ask, however, how *T. Levi* 19 fits in with this picture. In v. 1 the patriarch formulates the final choice to be made by his sons as that between darkness and light, and between the law of the Lord and the works of Beliar; this is in line with the dualistic ethical teaching of *TXIIPatr* and is influenced by passages like *Deut* 26, 16-19; 30, 11-20; *Josh* 24, 15. Unexpectedly, however, at this point the sons of Levi are introduced in the first person plural: "And we answered our father saying: Before the Lord we will walk, according to his law" (v. 2). V. 3 continues: "And our father said: 'The Lord is witness, and his angels are witnesses, and I am witness, and you are witnesses concerning the word of your mouth.' And we said: '(they are all) witnesses'." Vv. 4-5 return to the third person with a description of the patriarch's death and his burial by his sons in Hebron, just as in the other testaments.

(61) On this see now K. W. NIEBUHR, *Gesetz und Paränese*, Tübingen 1987, pp. 97-102.

(62) See H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 41-47 going back to H. W. HOLLANDER, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *passim*.

(63) See my *The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus* (see note 47) and cf. H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 67-76.

Vv. 2-3 are in keeping with v. 1 in that they solemnly underscore the (general) obligation to walk according to God's law. But does not the use of "we" and "our" in this context (which is found nowhere else in *TXIIPatr* and must for that reason be original (64)) suggest that *T. Levi* wants to be regarded as a testament of Levi for Levites? Do not, then, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* still bear a levitical stamp? (65)

The use of the first person plural may be a form element taken over from *Josh* 24, 14-22, but why the author did not simply change to the third person plural outside direct speech is not clear. Attention has been drawn to the «we» passages in the *Acts of the Apostles* and similar use of the first person plural in early Christian apocryphal *Acts of Apostles* and *Acts of Martyrs*. (66) But would the author have used this device unless he regarded himself as in some way standing in the succession of the sons of Levi? HULTGÅRD has suggested that this section represents an adaptation of a (lost) part of *Ar. Levi*. (67) But why was it kept in this form by the author(s) of the present testament?

It is possible that Christian priests identified themselves with the levitical priests of the old covenant. (68) Alternatively, we

(64) The variants involving a change to the third person plural in MS *g* and in MSS *dchij* are clearly secondary. J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*, p. 283f. regards 19, 1-3 as one of the many later additions to the original Testaments.

(65) In his article *The Levitical Hallmark within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984), pp. 531-537 Dixon SLINGERLAND has discussed this passage in detail. His criticism of others (R. H. CHARLES and J. BECKER in particular) is more convincing than his simplistic solution that "The Testaments is a product of Israel's levitical circles." On p. 536 of his article he speaks of "the general levitical partiality of the Testaments as a whole", a thesis defended by him in a second article *The Nature of Nomos (Law) within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986), pp. 39-48. Here the author, without paying any attention to the relationship between *T. Levi* and *Ar. Levi*, maintains that that "there is nothing here (that is: in *T. Levi* 9 and *T. Levi* 14,5) to suggest that the Testaments has lost interest in or rejected the cult" (p. 47). He also draws untenable conclusions from *T. Iss* 2,5; 3,6; 5,3-4 (see H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary on T. Iss* 2,5).

(66) So A. HILHORST in his review of H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary in Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17 (1986), pp. 252-255. He mentions (besides a variant reading in *Protev. Jac.* 19,2) *Actus Petri cum Simone* 4, "non esse qui nos confortaret", *Acta Johannis* 18 (*panlōn hēmōn akouontōn*) and *Marl. Pionii* 10,5; 18,13; 22,2; *Passio Fructuosi* 3,5.

(67) See his *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* II, pp. 121-122.

(68) See the question formulated on p. 112 of my *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*: "Does this indicate that the author was a converted Jew, belonging to the tribe of Levi, or was he a priest and did he consider himself in that quality a legitimate successor to the Levites?" The first suggestion cannot be substantiated and is, on the whole, unlikely; for the second one see the note on *T. Iss* 2,5 in H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*.

may point to JUSTIN's description in *Dial.* 116,3 of the Christian community as "the true highpriestly race of God". The Christians are the ones who (as priests) bring pure offerings to the Lord among all the nations, according to *Mal* 1,11. In TERTULLIAN, *De Baptismo* VIII,1 the anointing with chrism after baptism is directly connected with Moses' anointing of Aaron. (69) In *Hom. in Leviticum* IX,9 ORIGEN declares: "omnes enim, quicumque unguento sacri chrismatis delibuti sunt, sacerdotes effecti sunt", and he refers to *1 Pet* 2,9. The second solution seems the more probable one. The Christians responsible for the present *T. Levi* saw themselves as the true servants of the true highpriest announced by Levi in chapter 18.

(69) Cf. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *Cat. Myst.* III, 6 adding a reference to the royal anointing of Solomon by the highpriest.

THE PRE-MOSAIC SERVANTS OF GOD IN
THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE
PATRIARCHS AND IN THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN
AND IRENAEUS

1. *Introduction*

The question of the provenance of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is still a hotly debated issue.¹ In their present state they are clearly Christian because of clear references to Jesus Christ in a number of predictions concerning the future, but scholars differ in their explanations of the presence of these Christian passages. Are they the result of interpolation or of a more thoroughgoing redaction? Is it at all possible to prove the existence of pre-Christian, Jewish-Hellenistic Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?

Some years ago I made an attempt to formulate 'The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' in an article bearing this title.² For the purpose of the present contribution to the ongoing debate I may summarize some of the points made in the last section of that article, entitled 'The patently Christian elements' (pp. 521-24).

a. All investigations on the Testaments have to start from the text as we can reconstruct it in its earliest accessible form by the methods of textual criticism. This is a Byzantine text of an uncertain date. The question is: are we able to take two steps back? First, to the text known to Origen who quotes the work in his Homilies on Joshua 15.6—and who is the first to quote it. And, second, to a Jewish-Hellenistic text supposedly used and reworked, in one way or another, by Christians in the second century?

b. One should be cautious in using the labels 'Jewish' and 'Christian'. If, for instance, the Testaments use biographical material taken from the Old Testament or from Jewish haggadic traditions, this does not prove that the Testaments are Jewish, but only that the author knew the

Old Testament and had access to Jewish traditions, either directly or indirectly.

Moreover, the parenetic sections of the book which form its heart are not distinctively Jewish or Christian; much may be Hellenistic and Jewish and Christian at the same time, as Harm W. Hollander has shown in his *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.³ In fact, Jewish-Hellenistic parenesis and Hellenistic ethical writings have much in common, and there is not much distinctively Christian in the parenesis found in a great number of early Christian writings either.

c. The parenetic sections which use the biographical material to illustrate good and bad behaviour and its consequences are directly connected with the passages dealing with the future. Many clearly Christian elements occur in strategic places in those predictions. Unfortunately, these passages are extremely difficult to analyze. Certain recurrent patterns can be distinguished: e.g. in the "Levi-Judah" and the "Sin-Exile-Return" passages which are found in many testaments. There are also some passages dealing with the resurrection and others centering around an ideal saviour figure. Yet there is a great variation in detail, the passages are unevenly distributed over the testaments and sometimes combined unexpectedly. Moreover, the Christian elements occur in a diversity of places and function in different ways.

d. The debate over the provenance of the Testaments has concentrated on the passages dealing with the future.⁴ Many have tried to remove the Christian elements by literary-critical means, although it has proved difficult to define what should be termed Christian and what could be Jewish, and to reach agreement on the pre-Christian 'original'. In the article just mentioned I remarked that interpolation theories certainly oversimplify the issues. Whatever view is taken: we must speak of a Christian *redaction* of the Testaments and try to explain how the Testaments in their Christian form made sense for the readers who were supposed to use them.

e. This concentration on redaction-criticism leads to great uncertainty with regard to the existence of earlier Jewish-Hellenistic Testaments. It is reasonable to suppose that the idea of composing testaments of the twelve sons of Jacob, with biographical anecdotes illustrating ethical instructions and predictions of the future stressing the consequences of obedience and disobedience to God, was already conceived by Jews. On the other hand it is extremely difficult to prove beyond doubt that an

earlier Jewish-Hellenistic stage in the history of the Testaments actually existed; it is even more problematic to reconstruct the wording and content of this Jewish document.

Can we get any further than this? It might be suggested that the principal reason why scholars have tried to recover an original Jewish document categorized under the heading 'Jewish Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament' was their inability to imagine how the Testaments, apart from the predictions concerning Jesus Christ, could have been of interest to early Christians. What remained seemed to be Jewish-Hellenistic parenesis illustrated by Jewish haggadic material.

Now, as we have just seen, it is wrong to regard the parenesis as specifically Jewish-Hellenistic, and the use of haggadic traditions need not point to a Jewish origin of the Testaments. If so, can we explain how early Christians could take an active interest in the ethical instructions of the sons of Jacob addressed to their sons? I think we can; in the present article I shall analyze, first, a number of passages in the Testaments which formulate the purpose of the exhortations in the last words of the sons of Jacob, and, next, the predictions regarding the resurrection of the patriarchs.⁵ Then we shall turn to Justin's views on the obedience to God's commandments in the time before Moses and his statements concerning the future resurrection of those who have proved faithful. The next section will deal with Irenaeus' treatment of the question of the pre-mosaic law in *Adv. Haer.* IV 13-16. Comparison between the passages in the Testaments and those of Justin and Irenaeus shows that the Testaments may have functioned very meaningfully in Christian circles of the second half of the second century, and later.

2. The Testaments of the sons of Jacob as teaching to be handed down to future generations

In various places in the Testaments passages occur in which the individual patriarch explicitly formulates the purpose of his exhortations.⁶ Often it is said that these exhortations are meant to be handed down to future generations (T.S. 7,3; T.I. 6,3; T.D. 6,9; T.N. 8,1f; T.B. 10,4f), just as the patriarchs themselves received instruction from their fathers (T.L. 10,1; T.B. 10,4f; cf T. Jos. 3,3). The patriarchs predict what will happen in the future; they admonish their offspring to obey their (and God's) commandments (T.S. 7,3; T.L. 10,1; T.B. 10,4f), warn them against future sins and their evil consequences (T.S. 6,1; T.L. 10,1;

T.N. 4,1; T.G. 8,2), summon them to repentance when they sin (T.I. 6,3), and exhort them to obey Levi and Judah (T.N. 8,1f; T.G. 8,1f) in order to share in the future salvation (T.D. 6,9; T.N. 8,1f; T.G. 8,1f; T.B. 10,5). Their descendants will not be able to say that they did not know what would happen, and the patriarchs are not responsible for their sins (T.S. 6,1; T.L. 10,2; cf T.L. 14,2).

There is a clear and intrinsic connection here between the exhortations and the predictions of the future. As E. von Nordheim has said: "Er (= the dying patriarch) ist der festen Meinung, dass sich an den Normen, die er in der Vergangenheit auf Grund von Fehlern wie von richtigem Verhalten erkannt hat, auch die Zukunft seiner Söhne entscheidet".⁷

3. *The resurrection of the patriarchs*

Among the passages dealing with the future there are a number which explicitly deal with the future resurrection of the patriarchs. In T.Sim. 6,7 Simeon's resurrection 'in joy' is mentioned in passing; it may be connected with the phrase "Then Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will exult, and I, too, shall be glad, and all the saints will put on joy" in T.L. 18,14 at the end of a long section describing the future bliss at the coming of a new priest. A third passage which should be mentioned in this connection is T.Z. 10, where "I shall rejoice in the midst of my tribe" follows on "I shall rise again in the midst of you as a ruler in the midst of his sons". This verse is important because it specifies that only those sons of Zebulun will arise which "have kept the law of God and the commandments of Zebulun their father". Prediction and exhortation are, again, closely connected.

Next there is T.Jud. 25 which links the resurrection of the patriarchs with that of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (see v. 1; cf T.L. 18,14). There will be one people of the Lord and one tongue (v. 3, primarily referring to Israel) and all spirits of deceit of Beliar will be destroyed by fire. At the resurrection there will be a reversal in the fortune of men, particularly of those who are oppressed because of their obedience to the Lord. Israel's joy is contrasted with the sorrow and the weeping of the ungodly—and towards the end of the description 'all peoples' come into the picture: "they will glorify the Lord for ever" (v. 5).

The last passage about the resurrection of the patriarchs in the Testaments is T.B. 10,6-10; it follows directly on the final 'testamen-

tary' passage (10,4-5), that speaks about the spiritual legacy which the patriarch hands on to his sons, following the example of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob who admonished the sons of Jacob to keep God's commandments "until the Lord reveals his salvation to all the nations". Vv. 6-10 specify that this will be the time at which a general resurrection and a general judgement takes place. V. 6 mentions the resurrection of two groups of three: Enoch, Noah, Shem and Abraham, Isaac, Jacob. They are followed by the twelve sons of Jacob, each at the head of his tribe, "worshipping the king of heaven who appeared on earth in the form of a man of humility" (v. 7). Those who believed in him on earth, will rejoice with him. Israel which treated him unrighteously and the Gentiles who did not believe in him when he appeared on earth will be judged (vv. 8-9). Resurrection at the end of days and faith in Jesus Christ during his sojourn on earth are directly related. The six ancient men of God mentioned in v. 6 and the twelve sons of Jacob head a world-wide group of true believers. The sons of Benjamin should realize that they must "walk in holiness" before the Lord "so that all Israel will be gathered to the Lord" (v. 11). True obedience to God's commandments will obviously lead to faith in Jesus Christ. Israel will be judged because of its unbelief, but the obedient and believing sons of the patriarch will arise together with the holy men of old—and the purpose of the patriarch's parenesis is to bring all Israel back to the Lord so that it may share in his salvation.

There is no doubt that this chapter is Christian. It forms the end of the last of the Testaments: v. 2 gives the announcement of the patriarch's death, and v. 3 the final exhortation. It is followed only by an excursus on the apostle Paul in chapter 11 and the usual closing passage in chapter 12; it occupies, therefore, a special position in the structure of the Testaments as a whole. The real intentions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in their present form are expressed here, if anywhere.

It is appropriate, then, to compare the notions found in this chapter, as well as in the other passages mentioned under 2 and 3, with a number of parallel ideas in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*.

4. Justin on God's commandments in the time before Moses

Justin Martyr is the first 'orthodox' Christian writer who has something like a doctrine of Holy Scripture. Answering Gnostic and

Marcionite criticisms of the Jewish scriptures he defends the divine provenance and the authority of the Law and, in fact, of all books of what would become the 'Old Testament' of the Church. Von Campenhausen⁸ has shown how Justin uses the prediction-fulfilment scheme with great skill to prove the integrity of Scripture and the reliability of its predictions, particularly concerning Jesus Christ. Because Scripture tells the truth, Christian teaching can be considered as ancient and trustworthy. Justin does not accept the possibility of contradictions in Scripture. In a number of cases his differences with his Jewish opponents lead him to stress the authority of the Greek translation of the Seventy or to accuse the Jews of removing passages from Scripture (*Dial* 68,7; 71,1-3; 72,1-4; 73,1.5-6; 84,3-4; 120,5). Against the Gnostics and Marcionites he maintains the unity of the Bible. Texts which may seem to be antiquated are interpreted typologically or allegorically, and certain O.T. commandments which are taken literally are said to have been meant for the Jews only, because of their stubborn disobedience against God.

What this means for Justin's attitude towards the law of Moses in particular has been set forth by Th. Stylianopoulos in his book *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*.⁹ For the purpose of the present investigation the following important elements in Justin's rather complex treatment of the problem may be mentioned. First, there is the so-called 'tripartite division of the law'.¹⁰ In *Dial* 44,2 Justin states: "I mean that one commandment was appointed for piety and the practice of righteousness (εἰς θεοσέβειαν καὶ δικαιοπραξίαν), and another command and action was in the same way spoken either as referring to the mystery of Christ (εἰς μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ) or on account of the hardness of your people's heart (διὰ τὸ σκληροκάρδιον τοῦ λαοῦ)".¹¹ That is to say: some parts of the law provide ethical teaching valid for everybody everywhere and at all times, other parts are to be interpreted as prophecies of Christ and his salvation, while, finally, there are commandments intended only for the Jewish people which needed extra rules and checks because of its obduracy. In his discussion of the ethical teaching of the Law Stylianopoulos¹² stresses three aspects: First, the *Dialogue* does not speak about these binding universal principles at great length. "Both Justin and Trypho seem to assume the validity of a universally binding ethical βίος which is contrasted to the way of ritual law of Judaism."¹³ Second, the terminology used to denote them is rather vague. In *Dial* 45,4 Justin speaks of τὰ καθόλου καὶ φύσει καὶ αἰώνια καλά;

similar, but not identical terms are found in *Dial* 23,1; 28,4; 30,1; 45,3; 47,2; 67,10. Third, "it is important that, although these eternal principles are part of a universal law more ultimate than the Law of Moses, they are also to be found in the Mosaic Law."¹⁴ So in *Dial* 45,3: "For in Moses' Law too those things that are by nature good and pious and just have been laid down for those that obey and practice it ...". One may compare here *Dial* 93,1-3, which after stating that God exhibits among every race of men the things that are righteous at all times in all places (τὰ γὰρ αἰεὶ καὶ δι' ὅλου δίκαια καὶ πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην) continues by saying that all righteousness and piety are fulfilled in Jesus Christ's two commandments, to love God and one's neighbour.

To the third part of the Law belong a number of ritual ordinances. Justin speaks about many commandments, but the most important are those concerned with circumcision, the Sabbath, fasting, feasts, offerings and sacrifices, purity, and kosher food.¹⁵ The commandments pertaining to these matters were temporary measures. It is not even possible to keep them all at this time, says Justin to Trypho in *Dial* 46,2 (cf 40,1-5), and when Trypho points to "the observance of the Sabbath, and being circumcised and keeping the monthly feasts, and washing, if one has touched anything forbidden by Moses, or after sexual intercourse", Justin comes to his main point: "Does it seem to you that Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Noah and Job and any other similarly righteous men before or after these, and further Sarah the wife of Abraham and Rebecca the wife of Isaac and Rachel the wife of Jacob and Leah and all the other women of that kind until the mother of Moses, the faithful attendant, though they kept none of these things, will be saved?" (46,3). Trypho points out that Abraham was circumcised, and his posterity; Justin admits this but refers to explanations given earlier in the *Dialogue*: Circumcision was a sign by which the Jews were singled out as a nation destined for suffering (16,2), the true circumcision is a spiritual one (28,4; 43,2). Abraham was justified and received a blessing before he was circumcised, because of his faith (11,5; 23,4-5, cf 44,2; 92,3; 119,5). He concludes: "Now you are aware that up to the time of Moses simply no righteous man ever kept any of these things about which we have been making enquiry, or received any command to keep them, save that circumcision had its beginning from Abraham (46,4)".

Justin, then, distinguishes three periods "a) a pre-Law epoch prior to Moses and to Abraham, b) a Law epoch until Christ, which is related

only to the Jews and c) the universal epoch beginning with Christ".¹⁶ Against Von Campenhausen,¹⁷ Stylianopoulos stresses that this periodization is not very explicit. The period before Moses is not described at great length, but only mentioned by way of contrast with the period which followed; Justin wants to stress that there were, before Moses (or Abraham) a great number of righteous and pious men and women who did not know and could not keep the Mosaic commandments. One list of them is found in *Dial* 46,3 quoted above; another in *Dial* 19,3f, where we meet Abel, Enoch, Lot, Noah, Abraham, Melchizedek. *Dial* 45,2.4 (to be quoted below in section 5) mentions Enoch, Noah, and Jacob. To denote 'these saints' of the pre-Mosaic era Justin sometimes uses the term 'the patriarchs'. He uses it rather loosely, often together with the general term 'the prophets' (26,1; 56,9; 80,1; 85,3; 120,5). The word is found in the singular for Jacob (52,1; 54,1; 69,2; 78,8; 135,3) and Abraham (84,4). The plural occurs in the expression 'Abraham and the other patriarchs' (56,9; 113,4, cf 58,3). The others are not simply Isaac and Jacob, but a larger group (so clearly 126,5 'Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the other patriarchs'). They are the ancestors of the people (100,2; 106,3; 134,1; 141,4) but also the leaders of a wider community of true believers (see section 5 below).¹⁸

The example of the righteous people in the period before Moses shows that obedience to the Mosaic Law is not necessary for salvation. This has become abundantly clear with the coming of Christ. In *Dial* 11,2 Justin formulates his position quite clearly: "And a Law over against a Law has made the one before it to cease, and a Disposition coming into existence afterwards has in like manner limited any former one. And as an eternal and final Law was Christ given to us (αἰώνιος τε ἡμῖν νόμος καὶ τελευταῖος ὁ Χριστὸς ἐδόθη) and this Disposition is sure, after which there is no law, or ordinance, or command." The Jews are, therefore, urged to accept this new dispensation and the new lawgiver (12,1-3; 14,1-8; 18,3)—who as we have seen, summed up all that is righteous and pious in the two great commandments of love towards God and one's neighbour (93,1-3).

5. Justin on the resurrection

Now, if obedience to the one eternal and universal law of God is the only thing required of all people in all periods of history, it is clear that one need not be a law-abiding Jew to share in God's salvation. The Jews

are certainly not excluded: to Trypho's question (*Dial* 25,6): "Do you intend to say that none of us shall inherit anything in the holy mountain of God?" Justin replies that only those who persecuted Christ and still persecute him will be excluded. "While the nations that have believed in Him, and have repented for all the sins they have committed—they shall inherit, with all the patriarchs and the prophets and the righteous men that have been born of Israel. Even though they do not keep Sabbath nor are circumcised nor keep the festivals, they shall certainly inherit the holy inheritance of God" (26,1). The pre-Mosaic 'patriarchs' are also mentioned explicitly in *Dial* 45,(2.) 4. "Since they who did the things that universally, and naturally, and eternally, are good, are pleasing to God, so shall they also be saved by means of this Christ of ours, in the resurrection equally with the righteous who were before them, Noah and Enoch and Jacob, and any others there may be; together with those who recognize this Christ as the Son of God." This, again, includes the Jews insofar as they have kept the eternal and universal commandments found in the Law of Moses (45,3—see section 4 above). A very striking passage is *Dial* 80-81 where Justin joins Trypho in the expectation of a rebuilt Jerusalem in which Christians "will be gathered and rejoice with Christ, together with the patriarchs and the prophets and the saints of our race, or even of them who became proselytes, before your Christ came (ἅμα τοῖς πατριάρχαις καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους ἢ καὶ τῶν προσελύτων γενομένων πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ὑμῶν τὸν Χριστόν—Trypho is speaking!—80,1). He is aware of the dissenting views of other orthodox Christians (80,2), but maintains his opinion, referring to Isa 65,17-25 and Rev 20,4-6. Also notable in this context is *Dial* 130,1-2 where Justin quotes Deut 32,43 and then continues: "By saying this He means that we Gentiles rejoice with His people, I mean Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the prophets, and in fact all from that people who are pleasing to God" (καὶ ἀπλῶς τοὺς ἀπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ λαοῦ πάντας εὐαρεστοῦντας τῷ θεῷ). In 120,5 Justin accentuates the division within the Jewish people: "deeming some worthy of His everlasting kingdom with the holy patriarchs and prophets"; others "He will send ... to the sentence of unquenchable fire, with those of all the Gentiles who, like them, are disobedient and unrepentant". The 'patriarchs' are mentioned, together with 'the prophets', as true believers worthy of the kingdom of God.

It should be stressed that Justin, in the passages quoted in this section and in many others, cannot be called anti-Jewish. The polemical ele-

ment in the *Dialogue* is evident, yet—as Stylianopoulos has tried to demonstrate¹⁹—the *Dialogue* is not purely polemical; it was also written for Jews (and Christians) with the purpose of convincing the Jews. Hence, also, his emphasis on the notion of the ‘eschatological remnant’ in 25,1; 32,2; 55,3; 64,2-3 and the open ending of the *Dialogue* in chapter 142, where Justin says: “I urge you to enter on this greatest of all contests for your own salvation (ἐνστυσαμένους ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας μέγιστον τοῦτον ἀγῶνα) and to endeavour to prefer to your own teachers the Christ of the Almighty God.” (142,2).

6. Irenaeus on God’s commandments

For our purpose it is worth-while examining also Irenaeus’ opinion in this matter, which is expressed clearly in *Adv.Haer.* IV, 13-16.²⁰ His first statement, against the Marcionites, is that Jesus Christ “did not abrogate the natural precepts of the Law (*naturalia legis*) by which man is justified and which also those who were justified by faith did observe previous to the giving of the Law (*quae etiam ante legislationem custodiebant qui fide justificabantur et placebant Deo*), but that He extended and fulfilled them.” (13,1).²¹

Irenaeus quotes a number of texts from Matthew 5 to prove his case (see 13,1 and 3). The natural precepts are fulfilled because they are no longer obeyed by slaves but practised by free people: “in us they have received growth and completion—to yield assent to God, and to follow His Word, and to love Him above all and one’s neighbour as one’s self” (*assentire enim Deo et sequi eius Verbum et super omnia diligere eum et proximum sicut seipsum* 13,4). God called the patriarchs, the (Jewish) people, the prophets and helped them to serve him and to have communion with him (14,2); in the case of the people God did everything he could to keep them on the right track (14,2-3), when they were in the desert and when they entered the Promised Land. First God gave the Decalogue through Moses (*per naturalia praecepta quae ab initio infixae dedit hominibus admonens eos, hoc est per Decalogum*); he asked nothing more than he had always asked from men (15,1). Later it became necessary to give extra commandments because of their stubbornness (*et praecepta quaedam a Moyse posita eius propter duritiam illorum et quod nollent esse subjecti* 15,2). All this was in order to make them turn from idolatry and love God, so that they might have a share in God’s salvation.

Circumcision and rest on the Sabbath were ordained as signs, of spiritual circumcision and of dedication to the service of God and the rest in God's kingdom (16,1). Abraham believed in God before he was circumcised and he did not keep the Sabbath. Lot, Noah, Enoch and the many other righteous men before Abraham and patriarchs before Moses (*et reliquia autem multitudo eorum qui ante Abraham fuerunt iusti et eorum patriarcharum qui ante Moysem fuerunt*) were justified without observing the commandments just mentioned and the Law of Moses (16,2). These fathers had the 'virtue of the decalogue' in their hearts and showed this in their love towards God and their neighbour (*iusti autem patres, virtutem decalogi conscriptam habentes in cordibus et animabus suis, diligentes scilicet Deum qui fecit eos et abstinentes erga proximum ab injustitia ...* 16,3). Only when this was forgotten in Egypt, God revealed himself again at Sinai and formally promulgated the decalogue—with no other purpose than to prepare man for his friendship with God and harmony with his fellow-man (*praestruens hominem per decalogum in suam amicitiam et eam quae circa proximum est concordiam* 16,3).

The commandments of the decalogue remain valid for the Christians living after God's appearance among men in the flesh, extended and augmented (*et ideo similiter permanent apud nos, extensionem et augmentum, sed non dissolutionem accipientia per carnalem ejus adventum* 16,4 end). So Irenaeus stresses that God's will is expressed in the 'natural precepts' from the beginning to the very end: these can be found in the decalogue and summed up in the two great commandments. In the case of Israel God had to take extra measures, and to give extra rules; some people may think that this law was weak, because the Israelites did not obey. Their reaction is unfair: also among Christians many are called but few chosen; at the last judgment there will be disobedient Israelites and disobedient Gentiles. God has always respected man's free will "in order that those who do not obey Him should be righteously judged because they have not obeyed Him: and that those who have obeyed and believed in Him should be honoured with immortality" (15,2). The covenant concluded with Israel was a covenant of bondage, and it was followed by a new covenant of freedom; in the latter God abolished many commandments but he "increased and widened those laws which are natural, and noble, and common to all" (*qua autem naturalia et liberalia et communia omnium auxit et dilatavit* 16,5).

Irenaeus uses the term 'patriarchs' in much the same way as Justin, i.e. to denote the righteous fathers in the time before Moses (III, 11,8; IV, 14,2; 16,2; 21,1; 22,2; 23,1; 25,3; 26,5); he also often mentions them together with the prophets.

7. The Testaments and second-century Christianity

Justin and Irenaeus stand by no means alone in their views on God's commandments. Their ideas about 'natural law', in particular in the period between Adam and Moses, were shared by a number of other Christian theologians.²² We may remind here also of Philo's treatment of natural law, which reflects both Greek conceptions of natural law and traditional Jewish conceptions of the Noachian laws.²³ It was not discussed above because of the lack of direct parallels with the Testaments, if only because Philo does not speak about the resurrection at the end of days.

The examples given in the previous sections will be sufficient to explain how a book purporting to give the final exhortations of the twelve sons of Jacob, successors to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, could be of importance for Christians in the second half of the second century. They belonged to the period before Moses, had observed God's law in their lives, and had the necessary authority to exhort Israelites and Gentiles to walk in true obedience to God. The twelve sons of Jacob are not explicitly called patriarchs by Justin and Irenaeus; but they are certainly included in the group of pre-mosaic 'saints' commonly denoted by that term. For a book giving their parting words 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' was an appropriate title (cf Acts 7,8).

If we turn, again, for a moment to T.B. 10, a central passage for the understanding of the intentions of the authors of the Testaments, and look back at the material collected in sections 4-6 above, we understand that vv 3, 5 and 11 speak about God's commandments in very general terms. The same is true of other concluding exhortations in the Testaments parallel to v. 3 (see T. Jud 26,1; T.Z. 10,5; T.D. 6,8.10; T.N. 8,10; T.G. 7,7; T. Jos 19,6). Note also that in these and comparable passages in the Testaments the two great commandments are often mentioned together (see T.J. 5,2; 7,6f; T.D. 5,2f and especially T.B. 3,1-3; cf T.G. 4,1f; T. Jos 11,1) or separately: (for to love (or: fear) the Lord see T.L. 13,1; T.Z. 10,5; T.D. 6,1; for the command to love one's neighbour T.R. 6,9; T.S. 4,7; T.Z. 8,5; T.G. 6,13; 7,7; T. Jos

17,2). This may be compared with Irenaeus' emphasis on the two commandments as the essential ones. In contrast to this the Testaments nowhere teach the observance of the Sabbath, or of circumcision, or of the dietary laws. Marriage with Gentile women is forbidden in the case of Levi (T.L. 9,10; cf 14,6 where such marriages are mentioned among the future sins of the sons of Levi), but this passage goes back to the source which is used there.²⁴ Judah is said to have got into trouble by marrying a Canaanite woman (T. Jud 8,10-12), but nowhere do the parenetic sections warn against marriages with Gentile women. Joseph, in fact, marries the daughter of his masters (T. Jos 18,3) and the Testaments do not tell us that she became a proselyte first.

The resurrection of the twelve and the other patriarchs in T.B. 10,6-7, together with the faithful Israelites and Gentiles (vv 7-10), fits in quite well with the passages in Justin's *Dialogue* analysed in section 5 and Irenaeus *Adv.Haer.* IV, 15,2. Vv 8-9 exclude those among Israelites and Gentiles who rejected Jesus Christ—compare the remark about those who persecuted Christ in *Dial* 26,1. Against the background of the views of Justin and Irenaeus it is also quite understandable that there is a close connection between obedience to God and faith in Jesus Christ (v. 7.11).

Justin did not write with a polemic purpose only, but also made an attempt to convince the Jews. In *Adv.Haer.* IV, 22,2 Irenaeus emphasizes that God wants to save all who "feared and loved God and practised justice and piety towards their neighbours and have earnestly desired to see Christ, and to hear His voice". He continues with a reference to Rom 3,8: "For it is truly one God who has directed the patriarchs towards His dispensations and has justified the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision through faith". The Testaments, addressing themselves directly to the descendants of the twelve sons of Jacob, proclaim that Israel is called to share in God's final salvation and point the way towards it: Israel has to obey what is eternally valid in God's commandments and to believe in Jesus Christ. Their purpose is not polemic or apologetic, but clearly parenetic. They were not necessarily written as a missionary tractate addressed to the Jews, but they are certainly concerned with the fate of the Jews and want to convince them (and the Christians, who read this book and handed it down) that they are called to serve God, also after the coming of Jesus Christ, in order to participate in the glory of God's kingdom.²⁵

¹ See, e.g., the surveys of research in J. Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Judentums und des Urchristentums, 8) (Leiden 1970) esp. 129-58; H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A critical history of research*. S.B.L. Mon. Series, 21 (Missoula 1977) and G. B. Coleman, *The Phenomenon of Christian Interpolations into Jewish Apocalyptic Texts: A Bibliographical Survey and Methodological Analysis*, Diss. Vanderbilt University 1976, esp. 125-144; 239-313.

² It appeared in *N.T.S.* 26 (1979-80) 508-524.

³ Stud. in Vet. Test. Pseudepigr., 6 (Leiden 1981). See, in particular, his 'Conclusion' on pp. 93-97.

⁴ See now A. Hultgård's two massive volumes *L'Eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* I-II (Uppsala 1977-1982), reviewed by the present author in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 10 (1979) 100-102 and 14 (1983) 70-80.

⁵ For a more detailed treatment of the passages concerned see H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*. St.V.T.Ps., 8 (Leiden 1985).

⁶ On this see, especially, E. von Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten I. Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der Hellenistisch-Römischen Zeit*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums (Leiden 1980) 97-98.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, 101.

⁸ See Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*. B.H.Th., 39 (Tübingen 1968) 106-122.

⁹ Diss. Harvard Divinity School 1974, S.B.L. Diss. Series 20 (Missoula 1975).

¹⁰ See Stylianopoulos, *op. cit.*, 51-56.

¹¹ The translation used here, and elsewhere, is that of A. Lukyn Williams, *Justin Martyr. The Dialogue with Trypho* (London 1930).

¹² *Op. cit.*, 56-59.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, 56.

¹⁴ Again, *op. cit.*, 56.

¹⁵ Stylianopoulos, *op. cit.*, 65-68.

¹⁶ See Stylianopoulos, *op. cit.*, 110-121, the quotation is from p. 112.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, 116-122.

¹⁸ The expression 'the twelve patriarchs', used in the general title of the Testaments and in Acts 7,8, is not found in the *Dialogue with Trypho*.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, 33-44 and 165-168.

²⁰ I quote from Irénée de Lyon, *Contre les Hérésies* IV (ed. A. Rousseau) S.C. 100 (Paris 1965).

²¹ Transl. by A. Roberts and W. H. Rambaut, *A.N.C.L.* vol 5, 1864.

²² See F. Flückiger, *Geschichte des Naturrechts* I (Zürich 1954) 284-322.

²³ See H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge Mass. 1947) II, 165-200; 303-321.

²⁴ This view is commonly accepted. For details see H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*, General Introduction § 3.

²⁵ For the relation between Israel and the Gentiles in the passages in the Testaments which deal with the future see H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*, General Introduction 7.2 and 7.6, and a forthcoming article 'The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' (to appear in *J.S.J.* 16 (1985)).

DIE PARÄNESE IN DEN SCHRIFTEN DES NEUEN TESTAMENTS UND IN DEN TESTAMENTEN DER ZWÖLF PATRIARCHEN

Einige Überlegungen

Seit *Friedrich Schnapp* in 1884 in seiner Dissertation¹ die These zu beweisen versuchte, daß die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen eine ursprünglich jüdische Schrift sind, die später von Christen benutzt und interpoliert wurde, haben die Test XII einen festen Platz in Sammlungen von jüdischen Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments und in Abhandlungen über das Judentum in den Jahrhunderten um den Anfang unserer Zeitrechnung bekommen. Man hat auch versucht, die Ethik der Test XII für ein besseres Verständnis der frühchristlichen Ethik zu benutzen, insonderheit der Paränese Jesu. So gibt *R. H. Charles* in § 26 seines Kommentars (der im gleichen Jahre wie seine einflußreiche Ausgabe der Testamente erschien)² eine lange Liste von Stellen des Neuen Testaments, deren Wortlaut und Inhalt von den Test XII beeinflusst sein sollen. Im folgenden Kapitel (§ 27) bespricht er dann besonders die Lehre der Test XII über Vergebung, die zwei großen Liebesgebote und den Universalismus, und er findet wiederum mehrere Anknüpfungspunkte zu den diesbezüglichen Aussagen im Neuen Testament. In der Einleitung zu seinem Beitrag über die Testamente in dem Sammelwerk *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha to the Old Testament* faßt *Charles* sein Urteil mit den Worten zusammen: "The reader can consult my edition, pp. lxxviii–xcii, where it is shown that the Sermon on the Mount reflects in several instances the spirit and even reproduces the very phrases of our text: that many passages exhibit traces of the same, and that St Paul seems to have used the book as a *vade mecum*."³

¹ Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen untersucht (Halle 1884).

² The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs translated from the Editor's Greek Text and edited, with Introduction, Notes and Indices (London 1908); The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Oxford 1908).

³ *R. H. Charles*, „The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs“, in: *R. H. Charles* (Hg.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English II* (Oxford 1913), 282–367. Das oben gegebene Zitat ist auf den Seiten 291–292 zu finden.

Nur wenige Gelehrte sind *Charles* in der Annahme direkter literarischer Abhängigkeit der Schriftsteller des Neuen Testaments und sogar Jesu selbst gefolgt⁴. Vielfach sind jedoch die Test XII als Zeugen für die Ethik eines jüdischen Milieus benutzt worden, aus dem das Frühchristentum hervorgegangen ist oder mit dem es zumindest innigst verbunden war⁵. Besonders bei der Besprechung der Frage nach dem möglichen Hintergrund der Verbindung und Hervorhebung der zwei großen Gebote im Neuen Testament werden die einschlägigen Stellen in Test XII eingehend erörtert, z. B. die Frage, ob es in dieser Hinsicht einen wesentlichen Unterschied zwischen den Test XII und den neutestamentlichen Stellen gibt⁶. So werden die Test XII auch in den zwei kürzlich veröffentlichten, deutschsprachigen Handbüchern zur neutestamentlichen Ethik von *Wolfgang Schrage* und *Rudolf Schnackenburg* bei der Besprechung der zwei Liebesgebote zitiert⁷. Unser verehrter Jubilar macht dabei allerdings einen Vorbehalt, wenn er unterstreicht, daß die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen traditionsgeschichtlich schwer zu beurteilen sind. In einer Anmerkung verweist er auf *J. A. Fitzmyer*, der in seinem Kommentar zu Lk 10,25–28 daran erinnert, daß T Iss 5,2; 7,6 und T Dan 5,2f nur in den christlicher Interpretationen verdächtigten Test XII vorkommen und nicht in einer der in Qumran gefundenen, unzweifelhaft palästinensisch-jüdischen Quellen⁸.

⁴ Ein sehr extremes Beispiel findet man auf S. lxxxvi des Kommentars, wo *Charles* Röm 1,32 mit Test Ass 6,2 vergleicht. Der zweifellos ursprüngliche Kurztext von Test Ass 6,2 lautet: ὅτι οἱ διπρόσωποι δισσωδὶς κολάζονται. Spätere Abschreiber stießen, auf der Suche nach einer Erläuterung, auf Röm 1,32 und fügten ὅτι καὶ πράσσοι τὸ κακὸν καὶ συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσοι hinzu. Diese Ergänzung findet sich u. a. in dem von *Charles* hochgeschätzten MSC, Hauptzeuge der Familie α (die allerdings eine späte Stufe der Textüberlieferung vertritt). *Charles* zieht die Schlußfolgerung: „Hence the two above passages show that it was the α text that was used by St Paul.“

⁵ Vgl. *H. D. Slingerland*, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research (= SBL MS 21) (Missoula 1977), 37–38, und *H. W. Hollander*, Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (= SVTP 6) (Leiden 1981), 6–12.

⁶ So z. B. *J. Becker*, Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen (= AGJU 8) (Leiden 1970), 377–401; *K. Berger*, Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu. Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament. Teil I: Markus und Parallelen (= WMANT 40) (Neukirchen 1972), 42–45; 160–162; 581 f. n.1; *A. Nissen*, Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum. Untersuchungen zum Doppelgebot der Liebe (= WUNT 15) (Tübingen 1974), spez. 230–237; *K.-W. Niebuhr*, Gesetz und Paränese. Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur (= WUNT II 28) (Tübingen 1987), 122–124.

⁷ Vgl. *W. Schrage*, Ethik des Neuen Testaments (= NTD Erg. 4) (Göttingen 1982), 69–72; *R. Schnackenburg*, Die sittliche Botschaft des Neuen Testaments. Band 1: Von Jesus zur Urkirche (= HThK Suppl.-Bd. 1) (Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1986), 93–95.

⁸ Vgl. *J. A. Fitzmyer*, The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIX (= Anc 28 A) (Garden City, New York 1985), 879. Fitzmyers Behauptung: „some parts of this writing, preserved in its

Die Absicht dieses Beitrags ist, zu zeigen, daß die Verwendung von Parallelen aus den Test XII zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Ethik viele Komplikationen mit sich bringt. Es wird versucht, einige Grundfragen klar zu formulieren, damit voreilige Schlußfolgerungen über literarische oder traditionsgeschichtliche Abhängigkeit vermieden werden können.

In ihrer heutigen Form sind die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen eine während vieler Jahre von Christen überlieferte und kopierte Schrift. Darüber sind sich alle einig. Die große Frage ist aber, ob man mit Hilfe von literarkritischen Methoden eine jüdische Schrift herauschälen oder sogar mehrere Entwicklungsstufen unterscheiden kann. Hier gehen die Meinungen der Gelehrten bekanntlich weit auseinander, und diejenigen, die literarkritische Methoden handhaben, kommen zu sehr verschiedenen Rekonstruktionen der Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente⁹. In der Beurteilung der Paränese der Test XII als ein schönes Spezimen hellenistisch-jüdischer Ethik besteht aber weitgehend Konsensus. Ich möchte das anhand einiger Beispiele illustrieren.

*Andreas Nissen*¹⁰ nimmt deutliche und umfangreiche Spuren christlicher Bearbeitung an. Er gesteht aber zu, daß weder ihre literarkritische Aussonderung noch ihre allgemeine thematische Heraushebung oder ihre schichtenweise Abhebung auf traditionsgeschichtlichem Wege gelingen. Weil sich aber für den Bereich der Ethik kein einziger Gedanke als ausschließlich christlich, und darum als christlich bearbeitet, nachweisen läßt, betrachtet er die Test XII in dieser Hinsicht als vollkommen jüdisch, wenn auch nicht „normal jüdisch“.

Mit anderen Autoren betrachtet er den Versuch *J. Beckers*, aufgrund literarkritischer Analyse eine Grundschrift zu rekonstruieren, an die dann in späterer Zeit viele, zum großen Teil auch paränetische Stücke angewachsen sind¹¹, als gescheitert. Unter den Autoren, die sich eingehend

entirety only in Greek, did exist in Semitic form in pre-Christian Palestinian Judaism (e. g. 4QTLevi, 4QTNaph, 4QTBenj ...)", ist nicht richtig. Es handelt sich hier um Fragmente von verwandten Schriften, nicht um Bruchstücke der Testamente selbst. Siehe *H. W. Hollander – M. de Jonge*, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary* (= SVTP 8) (Leiden 1985), 17–25.

⁹ Vgl. *H. D. Slingerlands* *History of Research* (s. Anm. 5); *J. Becker*, *Untersuchungen* (s. Anm. 6) 129–154; *M. de Jonge*, „The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints“, in: *ANRW* 20, 1 (Berlin – New York 1987), 359–420.

¹⁰ *Gott und der Nächste* (s. Anm. 6) 36–39.

¹¹ *Untersuchungen* (s. Anm. 6) Kap IV „Auswertung der literarkritischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Analyse“, 373–406. Kritik an *Beckers* zwei jüdischen Schichten z. B. bei *M. de Jonge*, „Testament Issachar als ‚typisches‘ Testament“, in: *M. de Jonge* (ed.), *Studies on the*

mit den Test XII beschäftigt haben, ist eigentlich nur *M. Küchler*¹² Becker gefolgt. Obwohl er Becker in vielem kritisiert und zugesteht, daß oft keine letzte Sicherheit erlangt werden kann, versucht auch er eine Unterscheidung durchzuführen, weil seines Erachtens der Text ohne diese ein vielschichtiges, uneinsichtiges Konglomerat sich widersprechender Traditionen und Tendenzen bleibt. Er versucht sogar, die eingeschobenen paränetischen Fragmente wieder zusammenzufügen und die so wiedergewonnenen Paränesen, Mahngedichte und Lehrvorträge als strukturierte Texte darzubieten, deren gemeinsame Züge angeführt werden. Das ist für ihn auch darum wichtig, weil wir uns mit diesen Einschüben in der Zeit zwischen der Entstehung der Grundschrift der Test XII am Anfang des zweiten Jahrh. v. Chr. und der Übernahme der Test XII ins Christentum befinden, d. h. in der wichtigen Zwischenzeit der Vermittlung biblisch-frühjüdischer Weisheit in die rabbinische und christliche Zeit.

H. W. Hollander hat in seinem *Joseph as Ethical Model*¹³ konsequent versucht, die Test XII, so wie sie jetzt vor uns liegen, zu interpretieren und die Texte, die vom Verhalten Josephs oder dem Verhalten der anderen Brüder Joseph gegenüber handeln, als eine zusammenhängende Gruppe mit einer letzten Endes einheitlichen Paränese zu deuten. Es gelingt ihm, zu zeigen, daß für die Test XII Joseph das Ideal des guten Menschen verkörpert und daß viele paränetische Themen der Schrift in den Verhandlungen über den ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ im letzten Testament, T Benj 4–6 (zusammen mit Kap. 3 und Kap. 8) zusammenkommen. In ihrer Jetztgestalt sind die Test XII wenigstens bezüglich der Paränese eine zielklare Komposition. *Hollander* versucht zu zeigen, daß die Ethik der Test XII weitgehend von Ideen in den Psalmen und den weisheitlichen Büchern des Alten Testaments (insbesondere auch in den Schriften die nur in der Septuaginta überliefert worden sind) beeinflusst ist. Er findet in anderen hellenistisch-jüdischen Schriften (besonders bei Philo) und bei hellenistischen Philosophen viele Parallelen. Dann und wann liefert die frühchristliche Literatur die besten Parallelen, aber sie reichen nicht aus, um einen

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation (= SVTP 3) (Leiden 1975), 291–316; *H. W. Hollander*, Joseph (s. Anm. 5) 104, Anm. 58; *J. J. Collins*, Between Athens and Jerusalem (s. Anm. 14) 154; *A. Hultgård*, L'eschatologie des testaments des Douze Patriarches II (Uppsala 1982), 136–164; und schließlich *K.-W. Niebuhr*, Gesetz und Paränese (s. Anm. 6) 79–82.

¹² Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen. Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens (= OBO 26) (Freiburg – Göttingen 1979), 415–545.

¹³ (s. Anm. 5) bes. seine „Introduction“ (1–15); Kap. IV über T Benj (65–92) und „Conclusion“ (93–97).

christlichen Ursprung der Paränese der Testamente zu beweisen – wie sehr auch deutlich ist, daß in der Paränese weitgehend eine Kontinuität zwischen dem „offenen“ Judentum, das wir in griechischsprachigen Texten kennenlernen, und dem frühen Christentum besteht.

In seinem wichtigen Buch *Between Athens and Jerusalem*¹⁴ bespricht J. J. Collins die Test XII in seinem 4. Kapitel, das der „Common Ethic“ gewidmet ist. Natürlich sind die Testamente uns als ein christliches Dokument überliefert worden, und alle Versuche, frühere Schichten zu rekonstruieren, bleiben spekulativ. Zugegeben wird, daß vieles in den Test XII sowohl von einem Juden als von einem Christen geschrieben worden sein kann. Dennoch muß man ein allmähliches Wachstum des Textes annehmen. Auch die paränetischen Stücke der Testamente können verschiedener Provenienz sein, aber: „Ultimately the ethics of the Testaments cannot be pinpointed as the product of a specific situation. They are of interest for our purpose as material which seems to have accumulated and circulated in Hellenized Jewish circles over two hundred years and was eventually taken over by Christianity.“ Obwohl er die Kontinuität zwischen frühjüdischer und frühchristlicher Ethik berücksichtigt, nimmt Collins ohne weiteres an, daß bei der Übernahme der Schrift in christliche Kreise inhaltlich nichts geändert wurde. Die Ethik der Test XII gleicht der Ethik anderer Schriften aus der Diaspora darin, daß sie die spezifisch jüdischen Elemente nicht hervorhebt und allgemein philosophische Begriffe bevorzugt. Die Religion des Judentums wird als eine universelle geschildert, die in Übereinstimmung mit dem Naturgesetz ist. Als Sitz im Leben denkt Collins sich die Synagoge, besonders in der Diaspora, wo Juden aufgerufen wurden, ihre Identität zu wahren und viele heidnische Besucher sich zur Essenz der Lehre des Judentums hingezogen fühlten¹⁵.

Auch K.-W. Niebuhr, der in seiner Dissertation *Gesetz und Paränese*¹⁶ auf der Suche nach „katechismusartigen Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur“ ist, benutzt die Test XII als zuverlässige (und sehr reichhaltige), hellenistisch-jüdische Quelle. Inhaltliche und formale Vielfalt ist nach seiner Meinung geradezu typisch für die jüdische paränetische Lite-

¹⁴ Der Untertitel lautet „Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora“. Das Buch wurde 1983 in New York als eines der Ergebnisse des von E. P. Sanders geleiteten Forschungsprojectes über „Normative Self-Definition in Judaism and Christianity“ herausgegeben. Für die Test XII s. die Seiten 154–162 (das folgende Zitat findet sich auf S. 156).

¹⁵ *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 162–168.

¹⁶ (s. Anm. 6). Die Test XII werden in Teil II (73–166) besprochen. Die hier referierten Ansichten findet man auf S. 79–86, die folgenden Zitate auf S. 84 und S. 158.

ratur, und darum hat die inhaltliche Auswertung der Test XII als Quelle für die Paränese des Frühjudentums den Gesamtbestand der Schrift zu umfassen, und zwar trotz der Wahrscheinlichkeit, daß die Test XII, noch bevor sie in christliche Hände kamen, Veränderungen erfahren haben. Er gibt zu, daß es unmöglich ist, zwischen spezifisch jüdischem und spezifisch christlichem Gut streng zu unterscheiden, was besonders für paränetische Passagen gilt. Die christliche Bearbeitung ist in den messianisch-eschatologischen Aussagen am deutlichsten. „Es läßt sich jedoch nicht zeigen, daß solche in der Tat spezifisch christlichen Aussagen die Gesamtlage der Schrift und ihre Intention bestimmen, oder auch nur wesentlich beeinflussen.“ Das heißt: was nicht unbedingt christlich zu sein braucht, ist es auch nicht. Für die Untersuchung *Niebuhrs* sind die Test XII also eine zuverlässige Quelle. Er findet dann auch, daß viele „katechismusartige Reihen für die Gesetzesparänese“ in den Test XII verarbeitet worden sind, und zieht die Schlußfolgerung: „Die inhaltliche und intentionale Verwandtschaft dieser katechismusartigen Reihenparänese mit den erbaulich-unterweisenden Torazusammenfassungen bei Philo Hyp(othetika), Josephus (Contra) Ap(ionem) und Pseu(do-)Phok(ylides) weist darauf, daß es sich dabei nicht um ein Spezifikum der Test XII handelt, sondern daß sich hier eine geprägte paränetische Tradition des Frühjudentums niederschlägt.“

Aus dieser kurzen Übersicht wird deutlich, daß man auf die Hauptfrage, wie man die Test XII in ihrer heutigen, christlichen Form als zuverlässige Quelle für jüdisch-hellenistische Ethik gebrauchen kann, noch keine befriedigende Antwort gefunden hat. Vieles in den Test XII kann jüdisch *und* christlich sein. Parallelen in anderen (hellenistisch-)jüdischen Schriften haben nur beschränkte Beweiskraft, weil gerade in den ersten Christengenerationen viele (jüdische) ethische und allgemein hellenistische Regeln einfach übernommen worden sind. Daß in einigen Fällen die besten Parallelen in christlichen Schriften gefunden werden, beweist auch eher die Kontinuität zwischen Juden und Christen in ethischen Angelegenheiten als den christlichen Ursprung der diesbezüglichen Aussagen in den Test XII.

Unser Ausgangspunkt soll sein, daß die Test XII, wie wir sie vor uns haben, eine christliche Schrift sind. Wir können nicht beweisen, daß sie eine christliche Komposition sind (in der viele heterogene jüdische Traditionen verarbeitet worden sind). Es gibt allerdings einige Andeutungen, daß der heutige Text nach gründlicher Bearbeitung zustande gekommen ist. Ein jüdischer Grundtext der Test XII läßt sich aber nicht mit einiger Sicherheit herauschälen, weil die christliche Redaktion zu eingreifend

gewesen ist und sich nicht auf das, was offensichtlich und ausschließlich christlich ist, beschränkt hat¹⁷. Man darf nicht annehmen, daß die paränetischen Passagen in den Test XII von dieser Redaktionsarbeit freigeblieben sind.

So kann man die Frage stellen, ob nicht möglicherweise die gegenseitige Beeinflussung des Joseph- und des Jesusbildes die Paränese der Test XII inhaltlich mitbestimmt hat, z. B. in bezug auf die Erwählung und Hervorhebung bestimmter Themen. In meiner ersten Arbeit über die Test XII aus dem Jahre 1953 habe ich zu zeigen versucht, daß die Test XII Joseph als einen Typus von Jesus zeichnen¹⁸. *H. W. Hollander* hat das verneint, hat aber übersehen, daß zumindest T Benj 3,8 diese Typologie deutlich zeigt und daß weitere Anweisungen kumulative Beweiskraft haben¹⁹.

Der griechische Text, der zu Unrecht von vielen Forschern zugunsten der armenischen Übersetzung verworfen wird²⁰, läßt Jakob zu Joseph sagen: „Erfüllen wird sich an dir die Prophetie des Himmels über das Lamm Gottes und den Heiland der Welt, daß ein Unschuldiger für Gesetzlose dahingegeben werden wird und ein Sündloser für Gottlose durch das Blut des Bundes, für das Heil der Heiden und Israels sterben wird und daß er Beliar und seine Diener vernichten wird.“ Jakob sagt das zu seinem Sohn, nachdem Joseph ihn dringend gebeten hat, „daß er für

¹⁷ Ich habe mich bekanntlich zu dieser Angelegenheit verschiedentlich geäußert – s. z. B. *K.-W. Niebuhr*, Gesetz und Paränese (s. Anm. 6) 84 Anm. 50, 51, 53. S. jetzt *H. W. Hollander* – *M. de Jonge*, Commentary (s. Anm. 8) 82–85 und *M. de Jonge*, „The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Christian and Jewish. A hundred years after Friedrich Schnapp“, in: *Ned. Theol. Tijdschrift* 39 (1985) 265–275.

¹⁸ *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin* (Assen 1953; ²1975) 98 und 123 (vgl. 96–110). Für die Joseph-Typologie s. auch *A. W. Argyle*, „Joseph the Patriarch in Patristic Teaching“, in: *ET* 67 (1955–56) 199–201, der sich hier, wie in seinem früheren Artikel „The Influence of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs upon the New Testament“, in: *ET* 63 (1951–2) 256–258, auf den Standpunkt stellt, daß das NT und Kirchenväter (mit) von den Test XII abhängig sind. Er versucht folgendes zu zeigen: „In the Christian Church from very early times on the story of Joseph achieved great prominence. The Christian Fathers make use of it in two ways: 1) as prefiguring the Incarnation, Passion and Exaltation of our Lord; 2) as providing a pattern for Christian character and conduct“ (*ET* 67, 199).

¹⁹ Vgl. sein *Joseph as an Ethical Model* (s. Anm. 5) 13. Über Test Benj 3,7–8 sagt er: „The last two verses of chapter 3 (VV 7 f) do not fit in the context“ (69, und auch Anm. 32 auf S. 128). S. aber jetzt *H. W. Hollander* – *M. de Jonge*, Commentary (s. Anm. 8) z. St. Von Test Benj 3,8 her gesehen wird es wahrscheinlich, daß auch Test Zeb 4,4.10 und Test Gad 2,3 Übereinkünfte zwischen dem Geschick Josephs und Jesu hervorheben wollen. S. mein *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (s. Anm. 8) 99–101.

²⁰ Vgl. auch meine Studie über Test Benj 3,8: „Test. Benjamin 3 : 8 and the picture of Joseph as a „good and holy man““, in: *J. W. van Henten* u. a. (Hg.), *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (= SPB 38) (Leiden 1988) (im Druck).

seine Söhne bete, damit der Herr ihnen nicht als Sünde anrechne, was sie auch als Böses über ihn geplant hatten“ (V 6). Man muß sich hier vor Augen führen, daß dieses Gespräch zwischen Jakob und Joseph eine Illustration in den letzten paränetischen Kapiteln der Testamente (3–8) ist, die in 3,1 mit der Mahnung anfangen: „Und jetzt, meine Kinder, liebt auch ihr den Herrn, den Gott des Himmels, indem ihr den guten und frommen Mann Joseph nachahmt.“ Daß der gute Mann mitleidig ist und Barmherzigkeit übt, auch seinen Feinden gegenüber, wird in T Benj 4–5 deutlich gesagt. Die Versöhnlichkeit Josephs seinen Brüdern gegenüber findet sich auch in früheren Testamenten. „Joseph“, sagt sein Bruder Simeon in T Sim 4, 4, „war ein guter Mann und hatte in sich Gottes Geist; mitleidig und barmherzig trug er mir das Böse nicht nach, sondern liebte mich wie die anderen Brüder.“ Derselbe Gedanke kehrt in T Zeb 8 zurück und in T Jos 10–18, wo auch das Thema „Erniedrigung und Erhöhung“ auf Joseph angewendet wird (10,3–6; 17,8 – 18,1). Für die weiteren Verzweigungen dieser Themen in den Test XII sei hier auf das Buch *Hollanders* verwiesen.

In Hinsicht auf die Frage, die uns hier beschäftigt, ist es aber wichtig, zu beachten, daß nicht nur Joseph εὐσπλαγχνος καὶ ἐλεήμων genannt wird, sondern daß auch in eschatologischen Passagen das Mitleid und die Barmherzigkeit des kommenden Erlösers hervorgehoben werden. T Levi 4, 4 sagt, daß der Herr alle Völker „durch das Erbarmen seines Sohnes“ heimsuchen wird. In T Zeb 8, 2 lesen wir als Motivierung für ein mitleidiges Verhalten: „Denn in den letzten Tagen sendet Gott sein Erbarmen auf die Erde, und wo er mitleidendes Erbarmen findet, da wohnt er in ihm“ (vgl. auch 9, 8: „Heilung und Barmherzigkeit unter seinen Flügeln“). T Napht 4, 5 spricht vom Kommen „des Erbarmens des Herrn“, „ein Mensch, der Gerechtigkeit tut und Erbarmen vollbringt gegenüber allen, den Fernen und Nahen“.

In T Jos 17, 8 sagt Joseph: „Ich war unter ihnen wie einer der Geringsten“. T Dan 6, 9 schildert den Heiland der Völker als „wahrhaftig und langmütig, niedrig und demütig“. Auch der Heiland lebt exemplarisch; der Patriarch sagt von ihm: „... er lehrt durch die Werke das Gesetz Gottes“. In T Dan 5, 13 heißt es: „... der Heilige Israels wird unter ihnen König sein in Erniedrigung und Armut; und wer auf ihn vertraut, wird in Wahrheit im Himmel herrschen.“ Zu vergleichen ist hier T Benj 10, 7: „Bei der Auferstehung werden die Patriarchen auferstehen, anbetend den König des Himmels, der auf Erden in der Gestalt eines niedrigen Menschen erschien.“ Der Patriarch fügt hinzu: „Und alle, die an ihn glaubten auf der Erde, werden sich mit ihm freuen.“

Man kann diese ohne Zweifel christlichen, eschatologischen Aussagen (wenigstens zum größten Teil) nicht einfach als spätere Interpolationen ausklammern. Sie sind auf jeden Fall während einer wohlüberlegten, gründlichen Bearbeitung, unter konstanter Beachtung der paränetischen Passagen, die gewiß auch nicht unberührt geblieben sind, eingefügt worden. Wenigstens in bezug auf die Paränese über εὐσπλαγχνία und ἔλεος und die Niedrigkeit kann man die diesbezüglichen Texte der Test XII nicht ohne weiteres als Zeugnisse hellenistisch-jüdischer Ethik werten.

Es gibt noch eine andere wichtige Angelegenheit, die unsere Aufmerksamkeit fordert. Die sterbenden Patriarchen richten ihre Verhaltensanweisungen, Ermahnungen und Warnungen an ihre Söhne, die um ihr Sterbebett herumstehen, und über sie hinaus auch an kommende Geschlechter. Für letztere sind auch die zahlreichen Zukunftsansagen bestimmt²¹. Die Patriarchen geben weiter, was sie überliefert bekommen haben. So sagt Levi in T Levi 10, 1: „Und nun bewahrt, was ich euch befehle, Kinder! Denn was ich von meinen Vätern gehört habe, habe ich euch kundgetan.“ Sehr deutlich bringt dies auch der abschließende Abschnitt T Benj 10, 2–11 zum Ausdruck, z. B. in V 4–5: „Denn das lehre ich euch anstelle allen Erbes. Und ihr nun, gebt es euren Kindern zum immerwährenden Besitz. Denn so taten Abraham und Isaak und Jakob. Denn das alles vererbten sie uns mit den Worten: Bewahrt die Gebote des Herrn, bis der Herr sein Heil allen Völkern offenbart.“ Hier wird auch deutlich, daß die Gebote der Väter wesentlich die Gebote des Herrn sind (vgl. T Reub 3, 8; T Levi 19, 1; T Jud 13, 1; T Zeb 10, 2 und T Jos 3, 3 neben 4, 5–6). K.-W. Niebuhr, der auf S. 104–106 seines Buches eine Aufstellung der zahlreichen Belegstellen für die Worte νόμος und ἐντολαί in den Test XII gibt, ist der Meinung, „daß bei keinem der Belege ... die Deutung auf die Tora als ganze und ihre Einzelgebote auszuschließen“ ist. Er folgert daraus, „daß in den Test XII nicht über den Sachverhalt reflektiert wird“, daß „nach der vorausgesetzten Situation die Mahnung zum Gesetzesgehorsam in einer Zeit erfolgt, zu der die mosaische Gesetzgebung noch gar nicht ergangen ist.“²² Die Test XII unterscheiden sich in

²¹ Über den Zusammenhang zwischen Verhaltensanweisungen und Zukunftsansagen s. E. von Nordheim, Die Lehre der Alten I. Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit (= ALGHJ 13) (Leiden 1980), 97–98.101–107.

²² Zitat aus Anm. 97 auf S. 92, vgl. auch S. 239 und S. 193, Anm. 124. Niebuhr folgt hier E. Reinmuth, Geist und Gesetz (= ThA 44) (Berlin 1985), 25. Vgl. auch M. Limbeck, Die Ordnung des Heils. Untersuchungen zum Gesetzesverständnis des Frühjudentums (Düsseldorf 1971), 86–87.

dieser Hinsicht von anderen hellenistisch-jüdischen Schriften. Die in ihnen verarbeiteten katechismusartigen Reihen stimmen jedoch inhaltlich mit den Reihen überein, die dort gefunden werden. Es handelt sich um ethische Elementarunterweisung, die der breiten Masse der jüdischen Bevölkerung ein Leben dem Auftrag des Gesetzes Gottes entsprechend ermöglicht²³. Weil es sich um das alltägliche Leben handelt, spielen auch kultisch-rituelle Gebote der Tora kaum eine Rolle. Sie werden nur nebenbei genannt (T Jud 18,5; T Iss 3,6); wenn in T Levi 14 die zukünftigen Sünden der Söhne Levis aufgezählt werden, erweisen sich die Vergehen bei näherem Hinsehen als allgemeine Gebotsübertretungen, die aufgrund des Gesamtcharakters dieses Testaments auf das Priestertum zugeschnitten sind. Es wird aber auch nirgendwo eine kultkritische Haltung sichtbar²⁴.

Zu dieser Auffassung passen allerdings einige kritische Randbemerkungen. Zunächst einmal werden die Gebote der Patriarchen bestimmt nicht unreflektiert mit den Geboten des Mose verbunden. Mose wird nur einmal beiläufig genannt (T Sim 9,1).²⁵ Wenn in T Zeb 3,4 auf Dtn 25,5–10 referiert wird, wird die diesbezügliche Regel „dem Buche des Gesetzes Henochs“ zugeschrieben, und in T Ass 2,10 wird, nachdem in V 9 bestimmte doppelgesichtige Leute mit halbreinen Tieren, die in Wirklichkeit unrein sind (vgl. Lev 11,3–8 und Dtn 14,7–8), verglichen worden sind, auf „die Tafeln der Himmel“ verwiesen. In T Levi 5,4 wird gesagt, daß eine Beschreibung von Levis Vernichtung der Söhne Emors, die wir in Genesis 34 lesen können, in „den Tafeln der Himmel“ zu finden ist. In der Zeit der Patriarchen gab es die Bücher Mose noch nicht, und daher berufen die Söhne Jakobs sich auf das Buch (oder die Bücher, die Schrift) Henochs, auch wenn sie (insbesondere am Anfang der „Sin-Exile-Return“-Passagen) die Zukunft ansagen²⁶, oder auf „die Tafeln der Himmel“, die ebenfalls Gottes Offenbarung über die Zukunft enthalten (T Ass 7,5)²⁷.

Auf der anderen Seite wird von Levi vorhergesagt, daß seine Söhne das

²³ Vgl. K.-W. Niebuhr, Gesetz und Paränese (s. Anm. 6) 66–72.164–166.235–242.

²⁴ Vgl. ebd. 97–102.108.160.162.166.234.

²⁵ Die Genealogie Levis in T Levi 11–12 erwähnt zwar noch Amram und Jochebed (in 12,4), aber nicht mehr ihre Kinder.

²⁶ Vgl. H. W. Hollander – M. de Jonge, Commentary (s. Anm. 8) 39–40 und Anm. zu Test Sim 5,4. Zebulon las die zukünftigen Ereignisse „in der Schrift meiner Väter“ (Test Zeb 9,5, vgl. Test Levi 10,1). Die Söhne Jakobs stehen in einer Patriarchentradition.

²⁷ Vgl. H. W. Hollander – M. de Jonge, Commentary (s. Anm. 8) Anm. zu Test Ass 2,10, und C. Münchow, Ethik und Eschatologie (Berlin – Göttingen 1981), 44–53.

Gesetz entstellen werden, die Worte der Propheten verachten und gerechte und fromme Leute verfolgen werden; sie werden auch „einen Mann, der das Gesetz in der Kraft des Höchsten erneuern wird“, als „Verführer“ bezeichnen (T Levi 16,3). Der Heiland der Völker in T Dan 6,9, „der wahrhaftig und langmütig, niedrig und demütig“ genannt wird, „lehrt durch die Werke das Gesetz Gottes“. In T Levi 14,4 wird „das Licht des Gesetzes, das gegeben wurde unter euch zur Erleuchtung jedes Menschen“, mit demjenigen verbunden, den die Söhne Levis töten wollen, indem sie „den Rechtssatzungen Gottes entgegenstehende Gebote“ lehren (vgl. auch V 2). Auch in T Ass 7,5 finden sich Ungehorsam und gottloses Handeln gegen Jesus neben Nichtachtung des Gesetzes und, statt dessen, Hinwendung zu den Geboten der Menschen.

Auch hier kann man diese Aussagen nicht ohne weiteres als christliche Interpolationen entfernen. Die Bearbeitung ist ganz konsequent vorgegangen. Die Lehre und das Verhalten Jesu Christi bedeuten eine Erneuerung des Gesetzes; da wird das Wesentliche im Gesetz deutlich gemacht. Diejenigen, die sich gegen ihn auflehnen, zeigen damit, daß sie nicht dem Gesetz Gottes, sondern Satzungen der Menschen gehorchen²⁸. Die Aufzählung der zum Teil allgemeinen, zum Teil typisch priesterlichen Sünden der Söhne Levis steht unter diesem Vorzeichen.

Vor einigen Jahren habe ich versucht, zu zeigen²⁹, daß die in den Testamenten gefundene Sicht auf das Gesetz Gottes am besten erklärt werden kann, wenn man die Auffassungen von Justinus, Irenäus und anderen christlichen Autoren aus dem Ende des zweiten und dem Anfang des dritten Jahrhunderts mit in Betracht zieht. Was im Gesetz wesentlich ist, ist in und durch Jesus offenbart worden; schon die vormosaïschen Generationen haben das Gott Wohlgefällige, d. h., was allgemein, von Natur aus und ewig gut ist, praktiziert. Das ist auch im von Moses gegebenen Gesetz zu finden, aber wegen der Hartherzigkeit des Volkes hat er, nur für Israel und für eine bestimmte Zeit, eine Anzahl Extra-Gebote hinzufügen müssen.

Aus dieser Perspektive heraus ist es verständlich, daß auch für Christen die vormosaïschen Söhne Jakobs geeignete Personen sind, den kommenden Geschlechtern das Wesentliche des Gotteswillens mit Autorität einzuschärfen. Juden und Heiden, die sich an die Gebote der Patriarchen

²⁸ Vgl. Mk 7, 1–13, das in V 6–7 Is 29, 13 LXX zitiert.

²⁹ In meinem Artikel „The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus“, in: Vig Chr 39 (1985) 157–170. Vgl. auch H. W. Hollander – M. de Jonge, Commentary (s. Anm. 8) 68–76.

halten, werden an dem von Jesus Christus verkündeten Heil teilhaben. Justinus u. a. blicken zurück und äußern sich kritisch über das Verhalten des jüdischen Volkes und die jetzt nicht mehr notwendigen spezifisch-jüdischen Gebote im Gesetz des Mose. Die Autoren bzw. Bearbeiter der Test XII haben von dem von ihnen gewählten pseudepigraphischen Standort her keinen Anlaß, zwischen den von den Patriarchen gelehrtten Geboten und zusätzlichen mosaischen Bestimmungen zu unterscheiden. Die Vorhersage der Sünden der Söhne Jakobs dient den Lesern der Test XII als Warnung: sie müssen dem Gesetze Gottes treu bleiben. Was für die Patriarchen Zukunft ist, ist für sie Historie; natürlich wissen sie, daß z. B. die Söhne Levis auch priesterliche Gesetze übertreten haben. Das erwähnen die Patriarchen in ihrer Vorhersage auch, ohne daß es notwendig ist, darüber eingehend zu reflektieren. Die Leser haben jetzt zwischen Gehorsam und Ungehorsam zu wählen; in den Test XII stellen besonders die Söhne Levis ein abschreckendes Beispiel dar³⁰.

Nun hat kürzlich *H. Dixon Slingerland* die These aufgestellt, daß die spezifisch jüdischen, kultisch-rituellen Elemente des Gesetzes in den Test XII eine viel größere Rolle spielen, als die meisten modernen Ausleger der Testamente behaupten³¹. Sein Artikel kann hier nicht eingehend besprochen werden. Es soll aber bemerkt werden, daß *Slingerland* bei seiner Aufzählung von Stellen aus den Test XII, die seine These unterstützen sollen, nicht kritisch genug sichtet. Entscheidend können nur explizite Gebote sein, die auch für die Leser der Test XII eindeutig maßgebend sind. Juda hat z. B. viele Schwierigkeiten, weil er eine kanaanäische Frau geheiratet hat (T Jud 10–13). In den paränetischen Passagen wird jedoch vor Hurerei und den Listen der Frauen im allgemeinen gewarnt, nicht vor der Heirat mit heidnischen Frauen. Joseph heiratet die Tochter seiner Herren (T Jos 18,3). Daß unter den zukünftigen Sünden der Söhne Levis und der Söhne Dans (T Levi 14,6; T Dan 5,5) Sünden

³⁰ Vgl. Test Levi 4,4–6; 10; 14–15; 16,17, und meinen Artikel „Levi, the Sons of Levi and the Law in: Testament Levi X, XIV–XV and XVI“, in: *J. Doré – P. Grelot – M. Carrez* (Hg.), *De la Tôrah au Messie. Mélanges H. Cazelles* (Paris 1981), 513–523.

³¹ „The Nature of Nomos (Law) within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs“, in: *JBL* 105 (1986) 39–48 (vgl. auch seinen früheren Artikel „The Levitical Hallmark within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs“, in: *JBL* 103 [1984] 531–537). *Slingerlands* Hauptgegner ist *H. C. Kee*, mit seinem „The Ethical Dimensions in the Testaments of the XII as a Clue to Provenance“, in: *NTS* 24 (1978) 259–270. Er nennt auch *J. Becker*, *K. Berger*, *H. W. Hollander* und *M. de Jonge* als Vertreter des „recent consensus of scholarship“. Er beschäftigt sich nicht eingehend mit den ethischen Einsichten des hellenistischen Judentums, verwahrt sich nur gegen die von ihm öfters referierte These *Kees*, „daß die Test XII das Gesetz „in broad moral terms“ verstehen und „under the perspective on universal law developed by the Stoics“ interpretieren (S. 40). Damit engt er seinen Blick auf die Problematik sehr ein.

mit heidnischen Frauen genannt werden, besagt, wie oben schon bemerkt wurde, nichts. Daß in T Reub 4,6 gesagt wird, daß Hurerei, und in T Jud 19,1, daß Geldgier zu den Götzen führt, ist nicht nur für Juden, sondern auch für Christen von Bedeutung. Joseph bemerkt: „Seht nun, meine Kinder, wieviel die Geduld und das Gebet mit Fasten bewirkt“ (T Jos 10,1). Seine Meinung ist aber nicht spezifisch jüdisch. Wenn in T Levi 9,6–14 gesagt wird, daß Isaak seinem Enkel Levi „das Gesetz des Herrn einprägt“ und „das Gesetz des Priestertums“ lehrt und dabei nicht nur im allgemeinen vor dem Geist der Hurerei warnt, sondern auch explizit eine Heirat mit einer heidnischen Frau verbietet und nur reine Tiere für Opfer zuläßt, muß man zwei Dinge im Auge behalten: erstens, daß T Levi hier eine viel ausführlichere Quelle verwendet, die er erheblich kürzt³², und zweitens, daß es hier um Gebote für Levi und die levitischen Priester geht, die ohnehin nur eine beschränkte Zeit, bis zum Auftreten Christi, ihr Amt ausüben werden (4,4; 5,2; 8,11–15; T Reub 6,8)³³. Unter den vielen, üblen Auswirkungen der Hurerei und der Habsucht wird in T Jos 18,5 nebenbei auch erwähnt, daß sie „die Opfer Gottes verhindern“. Der einfache, integre Landmann Issachar opfert dem Herrn alle Erstlinge durch den Priester (T Iss 3,6; vgl. 2,5). Sein Beispiel führt zur Ermahnung der Söhne des Patriarchen: „Beugt euren Rücken zum Ackerbau ... und bringt Gaben dar dem Herrn mit Danksagung“ (5,3). Die verwendeten Formulierungen und besonders der Wortlaut der Schlußmahnung sind m. E. absichtlich allgemein gehalten; auch Christen können diese Anweisung befolgen³⁴. Er bleibt dabei: Die Test XII sind nur an den allgemeinen, auch von Nichtjuden zu praktizierenden Geboten interessiert.

Summa Summarum: Nur mit großer Vorsicht kann man Parallelen aus den Test XII zur Erhellung der Paränese in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments gebrauchen. Die Test XII liefern einen wichtigen Beleg für die Kontinuität zwischen hellenistisch-jüdischer und christlicher Paränese. Sie sind aber in gründlich bearbeiteter Form auf uns gekommen, und man kann niemals ausschließen, daß eine bestimmte ethische Passage den christlichen Ansichten der Verfasser der Schrift in ihrer Endgestalt angepaßt worden ist.

³² So auch K.-W. Niebuhr, Gesetz und Paränese (s. Anm. 17) 101. Für Einzelheiten s. meinen Beitrag zu dem Mémorial Jean Carmignac (1988): „The Testament of Levi and „Aramaic Levi““.

³³ Vgl. meine Beiträge zu den Mélanges H. Cazelles (s. Anm. 30) und dem Mémorial Jean Carmignac (s. Anm. 32).

³⁴ Vgl. H. W. Hollander – M. de Jonge, Commentary (s. Anm. 8) Anm. zu T Iss 2,5; 3,6 und 5,3.

TEST. BENJAMIN 3:8 AND THE PICTURE OF JOSEPH AS 'A GOOD AND HOLY MAN'

1. Introduction

1.1.1. R. H. Charles' edition of the text of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, first published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford 1908 (and later reprinted by the Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft) has exerted considerable influence. Many scholars studying Judaism and Early Christianity have taken over his results without questioning. In the case of the verse under discussion this meant that they followed him in accepting the much shorter text of the Armenian version (presented in retranslation into Greek in a separate column) as original, and regarded the longer Greek text as the result of Christian interpolation. After all Charles had printed many passages within brackets, suggesting that here, as in other places where no textual evidence was available, the original text could be reconstructed easily by deleting some obvious Christian phrases.

In his commentary on the Testaments published in the same year as the edition of the text Charles comments: "This idea of vicarious suffering and propitiation was not unfamiliar to pre-Christian Judaism, and especially with regard to the martyrs under Antiochus Epiphanes". By way of example he quotes 2 Macc 7:18, 38 (cf. 18:32) and 4 Macc 6:28, 29. Of 4 Maccabees he says: "the latter work belongs indeed to the first century A. D., but it expresses genuine Jewish thought on this question".

1.1.2. In this view T. B. 3:8 becomes one of the few early proofs for the existence of the idea of vicarious suffering and atoning death in Judaism. As such it has been exploited in studies on early Christian views on the death of Jesus, particularly on the possible influence of Isaiah 53 in early Christianity, and even on Jesus' own view about his death. I may mention here the influential studies by J. Jeremias¹ and E. Lohse², followed by many others³.

¹ See Jeremias, *TWNT* V, 685f (Reference to Isa 53; Messiah from Joseph).

² See E. Lohse 1963, 85-7 (no reference to Isa 53 or Messiah from Joseph; passage teaches vicarious suffering and death of Joseph as righteous one).

³ See E. Sjöberg 1955, 257-9 (reference to Isa 53, no Messiah from Joseph; Joseph

1.2. In the present contribution it will be necessary to discuss the text-critical problems first. Referring to earlier discussions in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, published in 1975 and the Leiden edition of 1978 I shall treat briefly the arguments pro and contra the originality of the shorter Armenian text, and, next, discuss a number of points where the text of T. B. 3:8 differs from that of Charles.

The next step will be an exegesis of T. B. 3:8. Here I am able to use the material collected in the new Commentary on the Testaments by H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge.

The final, and in many ways most important, question to be answered is: How does T. B. 3:8 fit into the picture of Joseph found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs? H. W. Hollander⁴ has shown how T. Benjamin concludes the exhortations in the Testaments with an elaborate disquisition on 'the good (and holy) man' and 'the good mind' (chapters 3-8). Particularly in chapters 3-5 the description of the good man is modelled upon the Joseph-story (see 3:1 and 5:5). It will be necessary, therefore, to study T. B. 3:8 both in its immediate context and in the general context of the Testaments.

1.3.1. In recent scholarship the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs have often been regarded as a (Hellenistic-)Jewish writing with a complicated history, in the end taken over by the Christian Church, and interpolated more or less extensively. Others, like myself, have regarded it as a Christian writing incorporating a variety of pre-Christian, Jewish material.

For the purpose of the discussion at the workshop it may be useful to state my present position very briefly⁵:

a) The present Testaments have functioned meaningfully in early Christianity. Significant parallels in thought can be found between them and early Christian writers like Justin, Irenaeus, Melito, Hippolytus⁶.

himself as righteous one is envisaged); M. Rese 1963 (reference to Isa 53, applied to a suffering righteous one); J. Becker 1970, 51-56 and 1980, 132f (Isa 53 may have influenced 'eine sprichwortartige Sentenz die aufgegriffen worden ist'; Joseph as suffering righteous one); J. Roloff, 1972-3, 49f (reference to Isa 53; death of righteous one; universalistic application not certain); W. Popkes 1967, 47-55 (non liquet; probably Christian); K. Wengst 1972, 65 (Christian); S. K. Williams 1975, 126-130 (non liquet; also 'Armenian' text interpolated by Christians); M. Philonenko 1960, 47-49 (*Arm* 'résumé' of *Gr*: Joseph as 'suffering servant' (Isa 53) 'type d'un autre personnage' = 'teacher of righteousness'); O'Neill 1979, 8-10 (reference to Isa 53, at the same time reference to Messiah from Joseph added). Compare M. Hengel 1980, 136 ('Aber die Ursprünglichkeit des Textes bleibt umstritten').

⁴ See H. W. Hollander 1981.

⁵ Compare M. de Jonge 1979-80; *ANRW* II 20; and H. W. Hollander—M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, Introduction, esp. §§ 1 and 9.

⁶ See M. de Jonge, "The Pre-Mosaic Servants", "The Future of Israel", "Hippolytus' Benedictions" and H. W. Hollander—M. de Jonge, *Commentary*, Introduction § 8.

b) The Christian elements in them are not simply the result of interpolation; in any case there has been substantial redaction. There is much more consistency on the level of the present text than is often claimed.

c) Reconstruction of a pre-Christian stage in the Testaments is impossible because of the thoroughgoing redactional activity of Christian scribes. For the same reason it is impossible to prove *or to disprove* that (purely) Hellenistic-Jewish Testaments ever existed. Scholars should realize that literary criticism is of necessity a very limited tool in the case of the analysis of highly complex writings like the Testaments which purport to transmit ancient tradition; they have been pseudepigraphical from the start, may be expected to have assembled as much relevant material as possible, and have 'invited' those who transmitted the text to insert traditions at their disposal.

d) Also a tradition-historical approach cannot lead to a delineation of stages in the history of the text in the sense that we would be able to assign certain sections, or certain phrases in sections, to a particular 'layer' in the text. We have only the final text as the outcome of a, no doubt, long process of assemblage: we are not in a position to posit earlier redactional stages resulting in earlier more original forms of our document.

e) In the case of the Testaments and other writings, the question has often been approached in terms of 'Jewish *or* Christian'. H.W. Hollander, in his dissertation (1981), has shown that as far as the exhortations are concerned, the alternative Jewish *or* Christian is just as difficult to handle as that between Hellenistic and Jewish. Subsequent work by Hollander and myself has convinced me that the Testaments as a whole have to be approached as a witness to the continuity in thought and ideas between Judaism (in particular Hellenistic Judaism) and early Christianity, rather than as a collection of material of different provenance.

1.3.2. In the case of the text under discussion in this paper this means the following: If we conclude that T.B. 3:8 refers to Jesus Christ and views his death in terms known from other Christian writings (and I think no other conclusion is possible) we have to ask what motivated the insertion of this prediction of Jacob at this point in the Testaments. By insertion I do not mean interpolation into an already consistent and meaningful whole; the verse forms the end, and in some respects the climax of chapter 3, and someone must have regarded it as a meaningful ending. Whether he redacted an existing text or composed the chapter, he must have seen some intrinsic connection between what had already been told about Joseph, here and earlier in the Testaments, and this utterance of Jacob. It does not make much sense to put a specific label to the remaining part of chapter 3 or to the description of the good man in

chapters 3-8 as a whole, and call it 'Jewish' or 'Christian'. It may have functioned in a Hellenistic-Jewish *and* a Christian context; at some stage the picture inspired someone to draw a parallel between this Joseph and Jesus Christ. The fact that this connection was made is important and points to continuity rather than discontinuity in the process leading to the redaction of the present text of the Testaments.

2. *Textcritical problems*

2.1. A good survey of recent studies on the Armenian version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is found in Stone 1977. He makes clear that many more manuscripts are available than were known to Charles, and that a new edition of the Testaments in Armenian on the basis of a limited number of manuscripts, divided in four groups, would be needed. As to the character of the Armenian version he remarks: "...it may be observed that the Armenian seems to start off the translation of certain Testaments following the Greek text closely, but then part of the way through a process of abbreviation, particularly in the parenetic section, commences..." (p. 104). Particularly in the last Testament, that of Benjamin, *Arm* shows very many abbreviations. Hultgård 1982, pp. 34-52, gives a full discussion of the many Armenian variants; he duly notes the many abbreviations of phrases and small sections particularly in T. Benjamin (pp. 42-52) and concludes that they are mostly secondary. Amongst other things he mentions that the Armenian gives a shorter text in T.B. 3:1 and 3:6 and that the Armenian passage corresponding to vv. 2-5 takes up that added after T.B. 2:5 in the Armenian version (Charles: 2:6-8). Strangely enough, the short text T.B. 3:(7-8) is regarded by him as original⁷. Here, as elsewhere, the Armenian is thought to go back to a not yet interpolated Greek text. In this Hultgård follows a number of earlier scholars who regard the generally secondary, shorter Armenian version as containing a number of 'non-interpolations'⁸. This hypothesis has been used extensively in attempts to delete a considerable number of Christian passages on the basis of textcritical arguments. De Jonge 1953, pp. 31-36, criticized Bousset and Charles on this very debatable point. Becker and Hultgård proceed with much more caution, without, however, giving up this non-interpolation

⁷ Note Hultgård's remark, 1982, 39 n. 1: "Les manuscrits arméniens que nous avons utilisés n'améliorent pas le texte de 3:8 donné par Charles ed. pp. 218-219".

⁸ Hultgård 1982, 40, n. 1: "L'absence des affirmations christologiques dans le texte arménien est pour Bousset [ZNW 1] 1900, p. 156, Charles 1908, Comm., p. 202, Becker 1970, pp. 51-56 and 1974, p. 132 l'argument principal de l'authenticité de la version arménienne en *Benj* 3:8".

theory. Becker 1970, pp. 51-56, combines a literary-critical approach with a text-critical one: The context in which T. B. 3:8 functions does not look beyond the boundaries of Israel—therefore the phrases *περὶ τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος τοῦ κόσμου* and *ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ Ἰσραὴλ* have to be regarded as secondary; *ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης* reminds of Heb 13:20 and has to go for that reason. Consequently we shall do wise to omit everything from *ἐν αἵματι* onwards⁹. “Blickt man jetzt auf A, so ergibt sich die erstaunliche Feststellung dass A nahezu genau diesen eben aus G geschälten Textbestand aufweist” (p. 54). Here several objections may be raised. Earlier I have criticized Becker’s thesis that in the case of the Testaments there is a transition from the stage of tradition-historical growth to the stage of textual criticism¹⁰. Other contributions in the *Studies*-volume of 1975, notably those by H.J. de Jonge¹¹, have made clear that the present manuscript evidence goes back to a MS in uncial script earlier than the ninth century. Even if we could prove that *Arm* was translated a few centuries earlier (sixth or seventh century)¹² there is still a considerable gap to be bridged.

Secondly: Why did the Armenian add the definite article before its equivalent of *ἄμωμος* and *ἀναμάρτητος*¹³? Becker’s reply that this use of the article has to be explained as generalizing is weak¹⁴. We must at least assume that for the Christian Armenian translator there was only *one* blameless and sinless one.

Third: Can Becker’s reconstructed text, agreeing with the Armenian, be explained as a non-Christian statement? The future ‘*will* be fulfilled’ is very difficult. Becker explains: the prophecy will be fulfilled in Joseph himself after Jacob’s prayer will have been heard. But Joseph, however much in distress, did not die an unnatural early death. He certainly suffered as a righteous one, but he did not give his life in obedience to God’s

⁹ B. does not offer arguments for deleting *καὶ καταργήσει Βελιάρ καὶ ὑπηρετοῦντας αὐτῷ* for which there are a number of parallels in the Testaments (see below, section 3).

¹⁰ See M. de Jonge, “Textual Criticism and the Analysis of the Composition of the Testament of Zebulun”, in *Studies* 1975, 144-160, esp. 157.

¹¹ See, especially, his “The earliest traceable stage of the textual tradition of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs”, in *Studies* 1975, 63-86.

¹² C. Burchard in Burchard-Jervell-Thomas 1969, 28; objections by M. de Jonge, “The Greek Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Armenian version”, in *Studies* 1975, 120-139, esp. 135-138. Compare also M.E. Stone 1977, 102-104 (reserves his opinion). Hultgård 1982 dates the translation in the fifth or sixth century. On his treatment of *Arm* and his textcritical conclusions in general, see M. de Jonge’s review in *JSJ* 14 (1983), 70-80, esp. 71-74.

¹³ So M. de Jonge 1953, 33. Only Ms *c* has *ὁ* before *ἀναμάρτητος* (contra Becker 1970, 55 n. 5: ‘alle Handschriften’).

¹⁴ He quotes J. Jeremias *Abba*, Göttingen 1966, 100 — who mentions instances of the generalizing article in texts where ‘die aramäische Grundlage erkennbar wird’!

commandments. It does not help to say: "Joseph lebte im Stande des Todes" (p. 56).

The verse remains difficult to interpret; but the shorter Armenian text is no less difficult than the longer Greek one¹⁵. Even Philonenko 1960, p. 48, regards *Arm* as a summary of the Greek; S. K. Williams 1975, pp. 126-130, starting from the Armenian version, finally only regards ἄμωμος ὑπὸ (so *c*⁺) ἀνόμων as original, and καὶ ὁ (with *c*) ἀναμάρτητος ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀποθανεῖται as an interpolation. Also the future πληρωθήσεται will have to be assigned to Christian activity.

Conclusion: There is no convincing reason why the shorter Armenian text would go back to a Greek text which is more original than that to be reconstructed on the basis of the existing Greek witnesses.

2.2. In the Leiden edition 1978 the following text is given:

- a Πληρωθήσεται ἐν σοὶ προφητεία οὐρανοῦ
- b περὶ τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος τοῦ κόσμου,
- c ὅτι ἄμωμος ὑπὲρ ἀνόμων παραδοθήσεται
- d καὶ ἀναμάρτητος ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀποθανεῖται
- e ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης,
- f ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ ἐθνῶν καὶ Ἰσραήλ,
- g καὶ καταργήσει Βελιάρ καὶ τοὺς ὑπηρετοῦντας αὐτῷ

Charles' text shows the following variants:

ἐν σοί] περὶ σοῦ	with <i>c</i> (+ Ngr)
οὐρανοῦ] οὐράνιος	with <i>c</i> (+ Ngr)
ὑπέρ] ὑπό	with <i>c</i> (+ Ngr)
ἀναμάρτητος] ὁ ἀναμ.	with <i>c</i>
καὶ Ἰσραήλ] καὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ	with <i>d m c</i> (+ Ngr)
καταργήσει] καταλύσει	with <i>g l d m e a f c</i> (+ Ngr)
ὑπηρετοῦντας αὐτῷ] ὑπηρετάς αὐτοῦ	with <i>g e a f c</i> (+ Ngr), compare <i>dm</i>

Charles' edition reflects his high esteem for *c* and the α-family to which this manuscript belongs (here Ngr is the only other representative extant). In *Studies* 1975¹⁶ and the Leiden edition 1978¹⁷ the editors tried to show that the subfamily α represents a relatively late and secondary form of family II to which all witnesses except *b* and *k* belong. Only in the case of the last two variant readings is *c*'s reading also found in the other ex-

¹⁵ J. Jervell in Burchard-Jervell-Thomas 1969, 39-40, discussing the passages dealing with the salvation of Israel and the Gentiles, concludes: "Die armenische Überlieferung ist deshalb eine spätere christliche Übersetzung und Bearbeitung, für die das Verhältnis Israel und die Völker ohne Belang ist, für die die Testamente das Schicksal der Menschen überhaupt darstellen, m.a.W. Universalismus".

¹⁶ See H. J. de Jonge, "Die Textüberlieferung der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen", *Studies* 1975, 45-62; M. de Jonge, *ibidem*, "The new editio maior", 174-179.

¹⁷ Especially pp. XXXIII-XLI.

tant witnesses of family II. Here the Leiden edition follows family I; in Appendix I (which gives all the variants between the two major families) these two cases are duly noted (p. 191). The editors indicate that they regard these two readings in fam I and fam II as of equal value.

3. Exegetical notes

3.1. Jacob speaks of a *prophecy from heaven*. His own words in Gen 49:7 are referred to by his son Simeon in T.S. 5:6 as *καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου Ἰακώβ προεφήτευσεν ἐν εὐλογίαις* (cf. Gen 49:1 and 28); but here some *future* prophesy must be meant. The Testaments avoid anachronism in referring to biblical texts: T.Z. 3:4 connects the ḥaliṣa-ceremony (Deut 25:5-10) to 'the law of Enoch'. In the Testaments Enoch is often mentioned as an authority concerning the future¹⁸; the patriarchs also derive their special knowledge from 'the heavenly tables'¹⁹ or from the writings of their fathers (T.Z. 9:5).

This prophecy is concerned with *the Lamb of God and Saviour of the World*. An ἄμνός ἄμωμος is mentioned in T.Jos. 19:3(8) where it comes forth from a virgin from Judah; it defeats all wild beasts (comp. T.B. 3:8g). In T.Jos. 19:6 ὁ ἄμνός τοῦ θεοῦ comes from Judah and Levi 'saving all the Gentiles and Israel' (comp. T.B. 3:8f).

For the expression 'the Lamb of God' see John 1:29, 36; for 'the Saviour of the World' see T.L. 10:2; 14:2 and John 4:42; 1 John 4:14.

The content of the prophecy is first of all given in clauses *c-d*. We cannot help thinking of Isa 52:13-53:12, particularly 53:5, 6, 9 and 12, but should realize a) that the verb *παραδίδωμι* and the expression *ἀποθνήσκω ὑπέρ* have become part of the Christian christological-soteriological vocabulary very early, and b) that (somewhat later?) Isa 53 was used as an inspiring proof-text by Christians trying to formulate the meaning of Jesus Christ's suffering and death²⁰.

For ἄμωμος see ἄμνός ἄμωμος in T.Jos. 19:3 and also 1 Pet 1:19²¹; for ἀναμάρτητος cf. Isa 53:9; 2 Macc 8:4; T.Jud. 24:1; PssSol 17:36; 2 Cor 5:21; Heb 4:15; 1 Pet 2:22. The term is used as an epithet of Jesus Christ in Justin, Dial. 102:7; 103:2; 110:6 and elsewhere in early Christian literature²². Clause *e* adds: *in the blood of the covenant* reminding of Mt

¹⁸ See Hollander-de Jonge, *Commentary* on T.S. 5:4.

¹⁹ See Hollander-de Jonge, *Commentary* on T.A. 2:10.

²⁰ On these questions see the literature mentioned in notes 1-3.

²¹ For the O.T. background (texts about sacrifices) and further instances of christological use see Hollander-de Jonge, *Commentary* on T.Jos. 19:3.

²² See Hollander-de Jonge, *Commentary* on T.Jud. 24:1 and T.B. 3:8. We may note that ἀναμάρτητος is used in 2 Macc 8:4 but of innocent children (νηπίοι) who perished in the persecution, rather than of the martyrs mentioned in chapter 7. Compare 2 Macc 12:42 where Judas urges his soldiers συντηρεῖν αὐτοὺς ἀναμάρτητους εἶναι.

26:28; Mk 14:24 and esp. Heb 9:20 (Ex 24:8; cf. Zech 9:11); 10:29; 13:20.

for the salvation of the Gentiles and Israel. Also in T. S. 7:2; T. Jos. 19:6 the Gentiles are mentioned before Israel. A clear indication of the Christian origin of the phrase²³.

will destroy Beliar and those who serve him. cf. T. S. 6:6; T. L. 18:12; T. Z. 9:8 and also T. L. 3:3; T. Jud. 25:3 (and T. Jos. 19:3 mentioned above)²⁴. On Christ destroying (καταργέω) death see 2 Tim 1:10 (at his ἐπιφανεία); Hebr 2:14 (by his *death* destruction of him who has power over death); Ep. Barn. 5:6 (manifestation in the flesh to destroy death and to demonstrate resurrection from the dead). 'Those who serve him' may be the evil spirits under Beliar's command, but also people who serve him (cf. T. A. 3:2).

3.2. The principal difficulty in our verse is ἐν σοὶ πληρωθήσεται. How can a future prophecy be fulfilled in the Joseph whom Jacob addresses? The textual variants at this point either do not solve the problem (ἐπί σε *d*; ἐπί σοι *m e a f*) or are obvious attempts to alleviate it and, therefore, secondary (omission in *l*; περί σου *c + Ngr*)²⁵. The solution: in you = in your tribe = in someone from your tribe, leading to the theory that T. B. 3:8 is the first instance where the conception of a Messiah from Joseph is found²⁶, has to be dismissed because there is nothing in the text to support it.

We get further when we realize that early Christian authors made use of the Joseph story as prefiguring the incarnation, passion and resurrection of Christ²⁷. The question arises, however, why the authors did not have Jacob say: "Your conduct, Joseph, prefigures that of him about whom it will be prophesied..." or words to that effect. Perhaps the solution may be found in the fact that in some typological speculations Joseph and Jesus are so closely connected as to effectively merge. In Hippolytus' commentary on the visions of Joseph in Genesis 37²⁸ Christ is addressed as ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ ἐπουράνιος Ἰωσήφ and asked to act as ἐρμηνεύς of what

²³ See Hollander-de Jonge, *Commentary*, Introduction § 7.6 "Israel and the Gentiles" and M. de Jonge "The Future of Israel..." for further details.

²⁴ For Jewish and Christian parallels speaking about the final annihilation of the forces of evil see Hollander-de Jonge, *Commentary*, note on T. S. 6:6.

²⁵ ἐν σοὶ is found in *b g*.

²⁶ See the survey of opinions in notes 1-3.

²⁷ See already M. de Jonge 1953, 123; consult now Hollander-de Jonge *Commentary* on this verse, mentioning A. W. Argyle, "Joseph the Patriarch in Patristic Teaching", *ET* 67 (1955-6), 199-201. On what follows see also M. de Jonge, "Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses' and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 245-260.

²⁸ See M. Brière, L. Mariès, B.-Ch. Mercier, *Hippolyte de Rome. Sur les Bénédiction d'Isaac, de Jacob et de Moïse* (P.O. 27.1-2), Paris 1954, 2-9.

has been announced in the past²⁹. At the same time it is clear that God revealed his mysteries to the earthly Joseph who was a visionary in whom the Word dwelt. More examples can be found in A. W. Argyle's article mentioned in n. 27. Though the expression is clumsy, its meaning is clear.

4. *T. B. 3:8 in its context*³⁰

In this final parenetic section of the Testaments Joseph is described as a typical 'good and holy man', an example for the sons of Benjamin (and the readers of the Testaments) who are exhorted to fear the Lord and to love their neighbour (vv. 1-5). Joseph *and* all those who fear the Lord and love their neighbour are protected by God against the attacks of their fellow-men, wild beasts and Beliar together with his evil spirits.

We are reminded of the thanksgivings in the first two chapters of T. Joseph³¹ which introduce the two stories about Joseph in T. Jos. 3:1-10:4 and 10:5-18:4. We should note the emphasis on 'testing', and on μακροθυμία and ὑπομονή in 2:7. The first story in T. Joseph describes how Joseph does not succumb to the wiles of the Egyptian woman; he prays, fasts, mourns and remains chaste. The concluding passage 10:1-4 praises Joseph's ὑπομονή, ἀγνεία and ταπείνωσης καρδίας. Here, as in the introduction (10:5-6) and conclusion (17:1-18:4) of the second story, the humiliation-exaltation scheme is applied to the patriarch; we also find it in T. B. 4:1 (immediately after the verse which concerns us) and 5:5. In this second story Joseph is portrayed as doing all he can in order to avoid putting his brothers to shame. This is emphasized in T. Jos. 17:1-2: "You see, children, how great things I endured (ὑπέμεινα) that I should not put my brothers to shame, do you also, therefore, love one another and with patience (ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ) hide one another's faults". T. Jos. 17 continues with a description of Joseph's loving attitude towards his brothers, also after Jacob's death. Here we note a link with T. B. 3:6 where Joseph asks his father to pray for his sons "that the Lord would not reckon to them whatever evil they had devised regarding him". This is also to be connected with Joseph's ἀμνησικακία (cf. Gen 50:15-21), mercy and compassion emphasized in T. Z. 8:4 and T. S. 4:4 leading to the exhortation μὴ λογίζεσθε ἕκαστος τὴν κακίαν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ in T. Z. 8:5.

²⁹ Compare Hippolytus' opening sentence: Παρέστω τοίνυν ἡμῖν αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος ἐρμηνεύς τῶν ἑαυτοῦ μυστηρίων γινόμενος.

³⁰ On this section see H. W. Hollander 1981, chapter IV, "Joseph as the 'good man' in the Testament of Benjamin", esp. 65-69.

³¹ On T. Jos. see H. W. Hollander 1981, Chapter II, 16-49.

Jacob does not pray, as might have been expected after Joseph's request³²; he calls Joseph his 'good child'³³ and tells him ἐνίκησας τὰ σπλάγχνα Ἰακώβ τοῦ πατρός σου. In the Testaments, as in the LXX, τὰ σπλάγχνα denotes (the seat of) man's innermost feelings, particularly love and compassion³⁴. The phrase just quoted may refer to Joseph's persuading his father to give up his feelings of anger towards Joseph's brothers³⁵; alternatively, one could think of Jacob's sorrow³⁶. In any case Jacob is subject to strong emotions; he kisses his son for two hours (cf. Gen 46:29) and pronounces that Joseph's obedience to God and his love for his neighbours prefigure Christ's vicarious suffering and atoning death for the salvation of the Gentiles and Israel.

Joseph's request of Jacob in v. 6 is entirely in keeping with the picture found in the rest of the Testaments. Jacob's reaction in vv. 7-8 may differ from what we would have expected; yet the chapter finds its climax in v. 8 and there are no traces of an earlier, different ending. To assume that there ever was one, and to reconstruct its content remains pure speculation. At what stage in the history of the Testaments v. 8 originated we do not know. We understand, however, how the person responsible for this verse (and, possibly, for more in this chapter and this testament) could see a direct connection between Joseph's attitude as depicted in the Testaments (particularly his love for his brothers, his willingness to bear sufferings in order to save them and his attempts to remove the punishment of God from them) and Jesus Christ's suffering and death on behalf of others.

³² H. W. Hollander 1981, 69: 'The last two verses of chapter 3 (vv. 7f) do not fit in the context. One would expect Jacob to pray to God and to ask forgiveness for his sons'. In the accompanying note (n. 32 on p. 128) he remarks that in the LXX βοᾶν is often used as a parallel to προσεύχεται.

³³ χρηστός and related words are often used in relation with terms for 'compassion' and 'mercy' in connection with God (for details see Hollander-de Jonge, *Commentary* on T. B. 3:7).

³⁴ See H. Koester, art. σπλάγχνος κτλ., *TWNT* VII, 548-559, esp. 549-553.

³⁵ So Hollander-de Jonge, *Commentary* on this verse. Comp. T. Z. 2:4 (and Prov 12:10 σπλάγχνα ἀνελειμμένα...).

³⁶ So Koester, *TWNT* VII, 551, 'du hast Jakob in seinem tiefen Schmerz überwunden'.

Literature used for this paper

- J. Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (AGJU 8), Leiden 1970.
- J. Becker, *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (JSRZ III,1), Gütersloh (1974), 21980.
- C. Burchard-J. Jervell-J. Thomas, *Studien zu den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen* (BZNW 36), Berlin 1969.
- R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford 1908.
- R. H. Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs translated from the Editor's Greek Text*, London 1908.
- M. Hengel, "Der Stellvertretende Sühnetod Jesu", *Int kath Zeitschrift "Communio"* 9 (1980), 1-25, 135-147.
- H. W. Hollander, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (StVTPs 6), Leiden 1981.
- H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary* (StVTPs 8), Leiden 1985.
- A. Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches I-II* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 6-7), Uppsala 1977/1982.
- J. Jeremias, Art. *παῖς θεοῦ*, *TWNT V*, 653-713 (with contr. by W. Zimmerli).
- M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*, Assen 1953 (21975).
- M. de Jonge (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (StVTPs 3), Leiden 1975.
- M. de Jonge c.s., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PsVTGr 1,2), Leiden 1978.
- M. de Jonge, "The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *NTS* 26 (1979-80), 508-524.
- M. de Jonge, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: central problems and essential viewpoints", *ANRW II* 20/1, 360-420.
- M. de Jonge, "The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus", *VigChr* 39 (1985), 157-170.
- M. de Jonge, "The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *JSJ* 17 (1986), 196-211.
- M. de Jonge, "Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses' and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 245-260.
- H. C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.) *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha I*, Garden City, New York 1983, 775-828.
- E. Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht. Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi* (FRLANT 64), Göttingen 1955, 21963.
- J. C. O'Neill, "The Lamb of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *JSNT* 2 (1979), 2-30.
- M. Philonenko, *Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qoumrân* (Cahiers de la RHPR 35), Paris 1960.
- W. Popkes, *Christus Traditus. Eine Untersuchung zum Begriff der Dahingabe im Neuen Testament* (ATANT 49), Zürich/Stuttgart 1967.
- M. Rese, "Überprüfung einiger Thesen von Joachim Jeremias zum Thema des Gottesknechtes im Judentum", *ZThK* 60 (1963), 21-41.
- J. Roloff, "Die Deutung des Todes Jesu", *NTS* 19 (1972-3), 38-64.
- E. Sjöberg, *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien*, Lund 1955.
- M. E. Stone, "New Evidence for the Armenian Version of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *RB* 84 (1977), 94-107.
- K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (StNT 7), Gütersloh 1972.
- S. K. Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event*, Missoula (Mt) 1975.

RACHEL'S VIRTUOUS BEHAVIOR IN THE TESTAMENT OF ISSACHAR

The *Testament of Issachar* in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* begins with the story of Reuben's finding the mandrakes in the field in the days of the wheat harvest. *T. Iss.* 1:3–15 retells Gen 30:14–18 (LXX) with significant dramatizing changes and additions. It is followed by a number of additional remarks in 2:1–5 emphasizing Rachel's virtuous behavior in the matter.¹ They reflect what is told in Gen 30:19–24 about Leah's giving birth to a sixth son, Zebulun, and God's remembering Rachel and opening her womb. According to the biblical story, she called her son Joseph, hoping to receive another son.

In the *Testament of Issachar* 2, these themes are treated in a remarkable way. Leah is portrayed as wanting to give up anything for intercourse with Jacob; Rachel is a paradigm of continency: "She despised intercourse with a man and chose continency" (2:1); the Lord saw "that for the sake of children she wished to have intercourse with Jacob and not for lust of pleasure" (2:3). She gave up Jacob yet another night, for there were two mandrakes (called *apples*, as in Gen 30:14 LXX). On this account the Lord listened to Rachel (*T. Iss.* 2:4; cf. v. 2). An angel of the Lord announces to Jacob that Rachel will bear two children because of this virtuous behavior (2:1). Leah, by way of contrast, is punished: instead of eight sons, she will bear six, the other two now being allotted to Rachel. And in case anyone would think that Rachel, after all, was keen on the sweet-smelling apples (see 1:3), we are told that "though she desired them she did not eat them but dedicated them in the house of the Lord, offering them to the priest of the Most High who was there at the time."

This very special interpretation of Gen 30:14–24 propagates a distinct view of sex and marriage. Sexual intercourse between spouses should be for the sake of children and not for lust of pleasure (φιληδονία), and continency

1. On the *Testament of Issachar* see also M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953) 77–81; "Testament Issachar als 'typisches' Testament" (*Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation* (ed. M. de Jonge; SVTP 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 291–316; and H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 233–52.

(ἐγκράτεια) should be preferred to intercourse (συνουσία). This idea is not unknown. In the section on "Conventional Subjects" of his *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*,² Abraham J. Malherbe prints fragment 12, "On Sexual Indulgence," from Musonius Rufus, in which we read:

Men who are not wantons or immoral are bound to consider sexual intercourse justified only when it occurs in marriage and is indulged in for the purpose of begetting children [ἐπὶ γενέσει παίδων], since that is lawful, but unjust and unlawful when it is mere pleasure-seeking [τὰ δέ γε ἡδονὴν θηρώμενα], even in marriage. . . . But furthermore, leaving out of consideration adultery, all intercourse with women which is without lawful character is shameful and is practiced from lack of self-restraint [δι' ἀκολασίαν]. So no one with any self-control [μετὰ γε σωφροσύνης] would think of having relations with a courtesan or a free woman apart from a marriage, no, nor even with his own maidservant.³

Musonius's attitude toward sex and marriage as expressed in this fragment (as well as in the fragments 13A and 13B on "What Is the Chief End of Marriage?") is representative of the teaching of Greek philosophers of various schools. That people have to marry for the procreation of children, so that the human race may continue and a new generation will be able to serve society in general and the state in particular, is a commonplace.⁴ The opposition between the pursuit of pleasure and one's responsibility for the perpetuation of the human race is also emphasized by Ocellus Lucanus in his *De Universi Natura* 44-45.⁵ Musonius is stricter than others in forbidding pleasure seeking even in marriage. Seneca agrees when he advocates temperance in marital intercourse and puts intemperance in sexual matters on a par with adultery.⁶

2. This book appeared as vol. 4 in the Library of Early Christianity (ed. W. A. Meeks; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986).

3. See pp. 152-54. Malherbe gives the translation of Cora E. Lutz, *Musonius Rufus: "The Roman Socrates"* (Yale Classical Studies 10; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947) 84-89. I have added some Greek words from this edition.

4. On p. 152 of his sourcebook, A. J. Malherbe refers to extracts given earlier, one from Maximus of Tyre *Discourse* 36, 6b: "Ask a married man, 'What is your reason for marrying?' He will answer, 'To have children'" (p. 78); and one from the section "On Marriage" in Hierocles, *On Duties* (see pp. 100-104). For other examples see, for instance, H. Preisker, "Die Umwelt des Christentums in ihrer Stellung zur Ehe. 1: Das hellenistisch-römische Heidentum," *Christentum und Ehe in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Berlin: Trivitzsch und Sohn, 1927) 13-65; A. Oepke, "Ehe I (Institution)" *RAC* 4 (1959) 650-66; G. Delling, "Geschlechtsverkehr" *RAC* 10 (1978) 812-29; and N. Geurts, *Het Huwelijk bij de Griekse en Romeinse Moralisten* (diss., University of Utrecht, 1928). See also O. Larry Yarbrough, *Not Like the Gentiles: Marriage Rules in the Letters of Paul* (SBLDS 80; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985) 31-63 ("Marriage Precepts in the Greco-Roman Tradition").

5. In *Neue Philologische Untersuchungen* (vol. 1; ed. R. Harder; Berlin: Weidmann, 1926). Cf. Iamblichus *De Vita Pythagorica* 210 (ed. L. Deubner; Lipsiae: Teubner, 1937).

6. "Nihil est foedius quam uxorem amare quasi adulteram," in a fragment from Seneca's *De Matrimonio* preserved by Hieronymus in his first book against Iovinianus (no. 85 on p. 434 in F. Haase, *L. Annaei Senecae, Opera quae supersunt* (vol. 3; Lipsiae: Teubner, 1878). On pp. 373-94 of his *Diatribe in Senecae Philosophi Fragmenta* (vol. 1 of *Fragmenta de Matrimonio*; Leipzig: Teubner, 1915), L. Bickel has given a critical text of Hieronymus *Adversus Iovinianum* 1. 41-49, indicating what may be considered to go back to Seneca's work. Bickel regards the sentence at the beginning of this note as coming from Seneca.

How are we to explain this parallel between the *Testament of Issachar* and a well-known representative Stoic philosopher of the first century A.D.? In order to answer this question, we shall first have to examine the position of these statements in *T. Iss.* 2:1, 3 in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Next, we shall have to look at early Jewish and early Christian writings in which the views expressed by Musonius return. Finally, we shall ask whether our investigation sheds light on the hotly debated question of the origin of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

CHASTITY AND SIMPLICITY IN THE TESTAMENT OF ISSACHAR

After the fashion of Gen 49:14–15 (LXX), the *Testament of Issachar* depicts Issachar as a farmer living a simple and good life. The central virtue in this testament is ἀπλότης, a word that may be translated as “simplicity,” “single-mindedness,” or “integrity.”⁷ “Singleness of heart” occurs parallel to “uprightness” (εὐθύτης; see *T. Iss.* 3:1, 2; 4:6). It leads to complete obedience to the essentials of the Law, love for the Lord and for one’s neighbor:

Keep, therefore, the law of God, my children,
and acquire simplicity
and walk in guilelessness,
not meddling with the commandments of the Lord
and the affairs of your neighbor.
But love the Lord and your neighbor,
show mercy to the poor and the weak. (5:1–2; cf. 7:6)

The hardworking farmer shows his gratitude to God by bringing offerings from the fruits of labor (*T. Iss.* 3:6; 5:3; cf. Rachel in 2:5). The farmer cares for all who are in need (3:8; 5:2; 7:5) and is therefore blessed by God (3:7; 4:1; 5:4–6). Toiling away and living a simple life, Issachar is able to avoid a number of bad habits and vices (3:2–3; 4:2–6; 7:2–4). In short, desire and love of pleasure do not get a hold on him. We may note here that Musonius advocates the life of a farmer or shepherd as the ideal occupation of a philosopher: “What is there to prevent a student while he is working from listening to a preacher speaking about self-control or justice or endurance [περὶ σωφροσύνης ἢ δικαιοσύνης ἢ καρτερίας]?”⁸

Self-control is also characteristic of the attitude of a simple man toward

7. See J. Amstutz, ΑΠΑΘΗΣ: Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zum jüdisch-christlichen Criehtisch (Theophaneia 19; Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1968). On *T. 12 Patr.* see pp. 64–85.

8. Edited by Lutz, *Musonius Rufus*, 82–83. The quotation is from Frag. 11: “What Means of Livelihood Is Appropriate for a Philosopher.” For other parallels to Musonius see Hollander and de Jonge, *Commentary*, esp. on 4:2, referring to R. Vischer, *Das einfache Leben: Wort- und motiugeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem Wertbegriff der antiken Literatur* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965). Vischer shows that the ideal of simplicity was an important topic in the work of Hellenistic moralists.

women. Issachar took a wife when he was thirty years old. Labor wore away his strength, and because of his toil, sleep overcame him; he simply did not think of pleasure (ἡδονή) with a woman (*T. Iss.* 3:5). He assures his sons: "Except my wife I have not known any woman. I did not act impurely by the uplifting of the eyes" (7:2; cf. *T. Benj.* 6:2–3). There and elsewhere in the *Testaments* there is a direct connection between seeing and sexual impurity (πορνεία). The statement about Issachar's marriage in 3:5 immediately follows the clause "walking in singleness of eyes." The single-minded man who is free from all sorts of desires (4:2) will not be overpowered by the spirits of evil. He is able to avoid various temptations. The first thing mentioned is that "he does not look to welcome the beauty of a woman lest he would pollute his mind with perversion" (4:4). In short, "he walks in uprightness of life and looks at all things in simplicity" (4:6).

SELF-CONTROL, CHASTITY, AND SEXUAL IMPURITY IN THE OTHER TESTAMENTS

In the *Testaments* Joseph is the paradigm of virtue.⁹ The *Testament of Benjamin* hails him as a good and holy man (chap. 3–8), and the first part of Joseph's own testament describes at some length the ten temptations to which he did not succumb in his struggle against the wiles of Potiphar's wicked wife (*T. Jos.* 2:7–10:4; cf. Gen 39:6–18). Joseph's self-control (σωφοσύνη) and purity (ἀργεία), together with his patience and humility of heart, are praised and held out to his sons and brothers as an example to be imitated (*T. Jos.* 10:2). Also in the second section of the *Testament of Joseph*, which concentrates on Joseph's attitude toward his brothers (10:5–18:4), the Memphian woman figures prominently. All along, Joseph's humility (ταπεινώσις [10:2]) and patience (ὑπομονή [2:7; 10:1, 2; 17:1] or μακροθυμία [2:7; 17:2]) are praised. It was because of his patience that Joseph took as his wife the daughter of his masters (18:3).

Joseph is the counterpart of his brother Reuben. According to *T. Reub.* 4:8–10, the magicians and love potions of the Egyptian woman had no effect on Joseph because "the disposition of his soul did not admit an evil desire" (v. 9). Indeed, "he purged his thoughts from all impurity [πορνεία]" (v. 8). Therefore, God delivered him "from all visible and invisible death" (v. 10). Reuben's sons are told: "If impurity does not overcome the mind, also Beliar will not overcome you" (v. 11).

Reuben, on the contrary, did fall "into the great iniquity [ἀνομία]." After he had twice seen Bilhah naked (*T. Reub.* 3:11–14), he could not restrain himself from doing "the abominable thing" (v. 12) that can only be classified as

9. See H. W. Hollander, *Josephus as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (SVTP 6; Leiden: Brill, 1981).

"impiety" (ἀσέβεια [vv. 14–15]). The patriarch repeatedly warns his sons against sexual impurity, which is especially dangerous in the case of young people (1:6–10; 3:9–6:4). Preparing the way for the admonitions of his brother Issachar, Reuben exhorts his sons:

Pay no heed, therefore, to the beauty of women,
and do not set your mind on their affairs.
But walk in singleness of heart,
in the fear of the Lord
and laboring in works
as well as wandering about in literature and with your flocks
until the Lord will give you a wife, whom he wants. (4:1)

Reuben warns strongly against women; they are all potentially dangerous. Joseph, he says, "guarded himself from every woman" (*T. Reub.* 4:8a). Men will do wise to keep at a distance (3:10; 4:1; 6:1–4). "Beware, therefore, of impurity, and if you wish to be pure in mind, guard your senses from every woman" (6:1). The *Testament of Reuben* 5 is downright misogynistic. Women, having no strength or power over men, use their wiles to take them in. Their makeup, their adornments, their beguiling glances bewitch people. In a very radical variant of the story of the union between women and the angelic "Watchers" before the Flood, the women are the ones who take all initiative (5:6–7; cf. *T. Naphth.* 3:5, which holds the Watchers responsible).¹⁰

In between the two references to the Bilhah story in *T. Reub.* 1:6–10 and 3:9–15, we find a remarkable double excursus. In 2:1–2 we hear about Reuben's insight into the machinations of the seven spirits of deceit (πλανή) commanded by Beliar—an insight received by him in the seven years during which he repented (1:9–10; 4:2–4). The first of those spirits, "that of impurity [πορνεία] is seated in the nature and the senses"; it is linked with "the spirit of insatiate desire [ἀπληστία],"¹¹ "located in the belly" (3:3). Before the patriarch, however, comes to speak about the seven spirits of deceit, he describes "seven spirits given to man at creation" (2:3–9).¹² For the purpose of our present investigation, two verses are of importance.

The second spirit in this category is "the spirit of sight, with which desire comes" (*T. Reub.* 2:4b)—also sexual desire, as illustrated in *T. Reub.* 3:10–14; 4:1; and 6:1; and, in a different way, in 5:3 and 6:7 (cf. *T. Iss.* 4:4; 7:2; and *T. Benj.* 6:3; 8:2).¹³ The seventh spirit is listed as "the spirit of procreation

10. See M. Küchler, *Schweigen, Schmuck und Schleier: Drei neutestamentlichen Vorschriften zur Verdrängung der Frauen auf dem Hintergrund einer frauenfeindlichen Exegese des Alten Testaments im antiken Judentum* (NTOA 1; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986) 439–60.

11. The opposite of ἀπλότης in *T. Iss.* 4:5; 6:1.

12. For Stoic parallels, see Hollander and de Jonge, *Commentary*, 93–94.

13. On Judah being deceived by his eyes, see note 16 below. Joseph remained steadfast while Potiphar's wife "used to bare her arms and breasts and legs," when she "very beautiful and splendidly adorned, tried to beguile him" (*T. Jos.* 9:5).

[σπορά] and intercourse [συνουσία] with which through love of pleasure [φιληδονία] sin comes in" (*T. Reub.* 2:8). It is "the last (in the order) of creation, but the first (in the order) of youth"; this constitutive aspect of human life brings with it very great dangers for young people (2:9).

These two verses bring us back to *T. Iss.* 2:1, 3. There is a natural link between intercourse and procreation. "For there is a season (for a man) to have intercourse with his wife, and a season to abstain therefrom for his prayer," Naphtali says in *T. Napht.* 8:8 (echoing *Eccl.* 3:5; *1 Cor.* 7:5), and he adds, "So there are two commandments, and if they are not done in their order, they bring sin." The trouble is, however, that abstention (ἐγκράτεια) is often not practiced because φιληδονία (love of pleasure) prevails.

Another slave of (the spirit of) πορνεία (impurity) in the *Testaments* is Judah. His unfortunate marriage with Bath-shua, the daughter of Barsan, the king of Adullam, and his misery about his children receive much attention (*Testament of Judah* 8; 10–11; 13–14; 16–17; 19). The fact that Bath-shua was a Canaanite is duly emphasized (10:2, 6; 11:1, 3; 13:3; 14:6; 16:4; 17:1). Judah knew "that the race of Canaan is wicked" (11:1) and that he transgressed God's commandments by marrying Bath-shua (13:7; 14:6). Yet in the admonitions to his sons, Judah does not explicitly warn against marrying non-Israelite women,¹⁴ and the descriptions of his meeting with Bath-shua highlight the dangers connected with an encounter with any woman. This time it is not only Bath-shua's beauty and her adorning that lead Judah astray (13:5; 17:1),¹⁵ but also the fact that she poured large quantities of wine (11:2; 13:5) and that her father showed a boundless store of gold on his daughter's behalf (13:4). Consequently, Judah warns his sons at great length concerning the evil effects of drinking too much wine (especially in chaps. 5, 14, and 16)¹⁶ and of love of money (φιλαργυρία [17:1; 18:2; 19:1–2]).

Also in the story of the meeting of Judah and his daughter-in-law Tamar (*Testament of Judah* 12; cf. 13:4; 14:5; chap. 15), not only Tamar's beauty, her dress, and her adorning receive attention (12:1, 3), but especially the fact that Judah did not recognize her because of his drunkenness (12:3, 6; 14:4–5). Strangely enough, Tamar's legitimate wish to have children, denied to her by her husband and his family (*Genesis* 38), does not receive attention. Judah, of

14. The same applies to Levi and his sons, as I have argued in my contribution "Die Paränese in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und in den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen: Einige Überlegungen," *Neues Testament und Ethik: Für Rudolf Schnackenburg* (ed. H. Merkley; Freiburg, Basel, and Wien: Herder, 1989) 538–50. *T. Levi* 9:9–14 (including the warning against the spirit of πορνεία and the command to marry an Israelite wife without blemish or defilement) goes back to similar instructions in the Aramaic fragments of *Levi*. For the author or authors of the *Testaments* these instructions apply only to Levi and his offspring during the period of the priesthood that has come to an end with the appearance of Jesus Christ.

15. Because Judah boasted of the fact that in his many wars (cf. *Testament of Judah* 3–7, 9) no comely woman's face had ever deceived him, and reproved his brother Reuben, "the spirit of jealousy and impurity" engineered his downfall (13:3).

16. Note, again, the influence on the eyes: "Wine turned away the eyes" (*T. Jud.* 13:6); "wine . . . leads the eyes into error" (14:1).

course, is the one to be blamed for all that happened. Yet in *T. Jud.* 15:5–6 women are portrayed as beings to beware of (in the manner of the *Testament of Reuben* 5):

And the angel of God showed me
that women have dominion over king and beggar alike, for ever;
and from the king they take away the glory
and from the valiant man the power
and from the beggar even that little which is the stay of his poverty.

Summing up, we may say that warnings against πορνεία, a broad term denoting a variety of undesirable sexual relations, are very prominent in the *Testaments*. Self-restraint and caution should prevail in the relationships between men and women, who should behave modestly. In some instances, women are described in negative terms (*Testament of Reuben* 5, cf. *T. Jud.* 15:5–6), but meeting with women is almost always dangerous for men who do not observe God's commandments—which are, in fact, the common laws of decency as taught by Hellenistic philosophers. Desire, love of pleasure, and lust (ἡδονή, φιληδονία, ἐπιθυμία) are always there and are to be held in check. The only legitimate union between man and woman is marriage. The purpose of marriage is procreation. Therefore, also within marriage, continency has a place. It is interesting that in the *Testaments*, which address men (because in all testaments the sons—and sometimes the brothers—of the patriarch are pictured as standing around his deathbed), there is at least one example of a virtuous woman whose self-restraint is praised: Rachel.¹⁷

FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS ON THE ESSENES

In *J.W.* 2.8.2–14 §§119–66, Josephus describes the tenets and practices of the Essenes, Pharisees, and Sadducees. As in *Ant.* 18.1.2–6 §§11–25, he treats these religious groups as philosophical schools. In his *Jewish War*, the Essenes receive a great deal of attention (only §§162–66 are devoted to the Pharisees and the Sadducees), for, as Josephus tells us, they “have a reputation for cultivating peculiar sanctity” (§119).¹⁸ In *Ant.* 15.10.4 §371, he describes the Essenes as “a group which follows a way of life taught to the Greeks by Pythagoras.”

At the beginning of *J.W.*, Josephus speaks about the Essenes' attitude toward marriage: “They shun pleasures [ἡδοναί] as a vice and regard temperance [ἐγκράτεια] and the control of the passions as a special virtue. Marriage they disdain, but they adopt other men's children. . . . They do not, indeed, on

17. Küchler, *Schwetgen, Schmuck und Schleier*, concentrates on the stories about Potiphar's wife and about Bilhah, Bath-shua, and Tamar and so gives a one-sided picture of the attitude toward women in the *Testaments*.

18. The translations from Josephus's works in this section are those by Thackeray, Marcus, Wikgren, and Feldman in LCL.

principle, condemn wedlock and the propagation thereby of the race, but they wish to protect themselves against women's wantonness [ἀσελγείαι] being persuaded that none of the sex keeps her plighted troth to one man" (§§120–21).

At the end of his description of the Essenes (§§160–61), Josephus introduces another order of Essenes that differs in its attitude to marriage: "They think that those who decline to marry cut off the chief function of life, the propagation of the race [διαδοχή—a word also used in §121]. . . . They have no intercourse with them [namely, their wives] during pregnancy, thus showing that their motive in marrying is not self-indulgence but the procreation of children [τὸ μὴ δι' ἡδονὴν ἀλλὰ τέκνων χρεῖαν γαμεῖν]." This special group of Essenes is mentioned only here by Josephus. In *Ant.* 18.1.5 §21 he states that the Essenes do not bring wives into the community.¹⁹ For our purpose, we need not determine the actual situation, nor is it necessary to compare the description in these passages of Josephus with what the documents and archaeological remains tell us about the community at Qumran.²⁰ In the context of this present contribution, it is interesting to note a few clearly Hellenistic notions.

According to Josephus, both groups of Essenes regard the propagation of the human race as the purpose of marriage. Both shun passion and pleasure (ἡδονή), the first group opting for complete ἐγκράτεια (abstention) and the second abstaining from sexual intercourse during pregnancy.²¹ Josephus returns to this issue when, in an apologetic treatment of various essential commandments of the Law in *Ag. Ap.* 2.22–30 §§190–219, he speaks about marriage laws. His first statement follows: "The Law recognizes no sexual connections, except the natural union of man and wife, and that only for the procreation of children [τέκνων ἔνεκα]" (§199). A little further, H. St. J. Thackeray translates a difficult passage as "none who has intercourse with a woman who is with child can be considered pure" (§202).²² If this translation is correct, we have another parallel with Josephus's description of the second Essene group.

The final clause in *J.W.* 2 §121 shows an extremely low opinion of women in general. It is only surpassed by Philo (as quoted by Eusebius *Prep. Ev.* 8.11.1–18), who explains that the Essenes prefer continency (ἐγκράτεια) to marriage because "a wife [or woman] is a selfish creature, excessively jealous

19. Compare Philo in Eusebius *Prep. Ev.* 8.11–18 (to be discussed below in the section on Josephus), and Pliny *HN* 5.17: "sine ulla femina, omni venere abdicata."

20. On this, see Todd S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

21. In the fragment mentioned in note 6, Seneca also regards intercourse during pregnancy as undesirable: "Certe qui dicunt se causa reipublicae et generis humani uxoribus iungi et liberos tollere, imitentur saltem pecudes et postquam uxorem venter intumuerit, non perdant filios, nec amatores uxoribus se exhibeant sed maritos." Bickel, *Diatribae*, ascribes this statement to Jerome.

22. The crucial expression is εἴ τις ἐπὶ λεχοῦς φθορὰν παρέλθοι. The clause follows on the prohibition of abortion and destruction of a fetus. See also *Ps. Phoc.* 186, "Lay not your hand upon your wife when she is pregnant," and P. W. van der Horst's comment in his *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (SVTP 4; Leiden: Brill, 1978) 234–35.

and an adept at beguiling the morals of her husband [or a man] and seducing him by her continued impostures [γοητεία]. For by the fawning talk which she practises and the other ways in which she plays her part like an actress on the stage she first ensnares the sight and hearing, and when these subjects as it were have been duped she cajoles the sovereign mind."²³

Here we are very near to the assessment of women found in the *Testament of Reuben* 5 (and the emphasis in the *Testaments* that desire comes with sight—see *T. Reub.* 2:4). Yet the two passages concerned are not typical of Philo (as we shall see presently) or of Josephus, according to whom even the more radical Essenes were not against marriage on principle. Of course, the Law tells people to marry for the sake of children, not for pleasure's sake. As a final example, in *Ant.* 4.8.24 §261, parents have to tell their rebellious children (*Deut* 21:18) "that they came together in matrimony not for pleasure's sake [οὐχ ἡδονῆς ἕνεκα], nor to increase their fortunes by uniting their several properties to one, but that they might have children who should tend their old age and who should receive from them everything that they needed."²⁴

In all instances concerned, Josephus writes with outsiders in mind, and this accounts for the manner in which he expresses the essentials of the Jewish law and the Essene way of life.²⁵ Of course, G. Vermes is right when, in his comments on the summary of the Law in *Ag. Ap.*, he remarks: "Apropos of marriage laws, which are listed in conjunction with sexual impurity, Josephus maintains firmly that the purpose of marital union is procreation (199), thereby echoing the common teaching based on the divine commandment, 'Be fruitful and multiply' (*Gen* 1:28)."²⁶ The opposition—sexual union for pleasure or for the sake of children—however, is certainly Hellenistic.²⁷

23. Translated by Colson in LCL. Cf. *Quaest. in Gn.* 1.43 (on *Gen* 3:8). "It was the more imperfect and ignoble element, the female, that made a beginning of transgression and lawlessness, while the male made the beginning of reverence and modesty and all good, since he was better and more perfect" (trans. Marcus in LCL).

24. Cf. *Ant.* 3.12.1 §273: "Adultery he absolutely prohibited, deeming it blessed that men should be sane-minded concerning wedlock and that it was to the interest alike of the state and the family that children should be legitimate."

25. This general statement holds true whether Josephus and others portraying the essentials of the Jewish law wrote with a missionary or an apologetic purpose, or in order to remind Jews in the Diaspora of the central tenets of their religion and way of life. On these questions, see, for example, J. E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel* (FRLANT 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) 99, who speaks of missionary activity of Jewish propagandists receptive to Hellenistic influences; John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983) 167–68, who links Jewish identity and the appeal to Gentiles; and K. W. Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Paränese* (WUNT 2. 28; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987) 69, who uses the term "Apologetik nach innen."

²⁶ See G. Vermes, "A Summary of the Law by Flavius Josephus," *NovT* 24 (1982) 289–303; quotation from p. 296.

²⁷ See the introductory section on Musonius and the section on Philo directly below.

PHILO'S IDEAS ON MARRIAGE AND PROCREATION

The two quotations from Philo given in the preceding section underscore Wayne A. Meeks's negative assessment of this philosopher's attitude toward women.²⁸ Meeks calls Philo the most blatant example of misogyny, reminding us that Philo "commonly uses the female figures as symbols of *aisthēsis* [sense-perception] or *pathos* [emotion], but the male for *nous* [mind] and *logos* [reason]" and that he "associates with woman an extraordinary number of pejorative expressions." Yet, as Meeks remarks, "Philo is both Jewish and Greek enough to regard marriage as natural and necessary—but the husband's relationship to his wife is like that of father to children and owner to slaves."

In fact, in many places in his voluminous oeuvre, Philo links marriage and procreation, very often adding a negative remark about pleasure (*Op. Mund.* 161; *Det. Pot. Ins.* 102; *Cher.* 43, 50; *Congr.* 12; *Abr.* 137, 248–49; *Jos.* 43; *Vit. Mos.* 1.28; *Decal.* 119; *Spec. Leg.* 3.9, 32, 34–46, 112–13; *Virt.* 207; *Praem. Poen.* 108–9; *Quaest. in Gn.* 3.21; 4.86). There is no need to discuss all examples here, for Philo is clearly dealing with an issue familiar to him and his readers. We should note that in *Op. Mund.* 161, in an invective against φιληδονία (love of pleasure) in which the serpent of Genesis 3 is said to symbolize ἡδονή (pleasure), Philo concedes: "And certainly the first approaches of the male to the female have pleasure to guide and conduct them, and it is through pleasure that begetting and the coming of life is brought about."²⁹ In *Spec. Leg.* 3.112, however, he follows the usual pattern: "For they are pleasure-lovers [φιλήδονοι] when they mate with their wives, not to procreate children and to perpetuate the race, but like pigs and goats in quest of the enjoyment which such intercourse gives"³⁰ (cf. *T. Iss.* 2:3).

In *Spec. Leg.* 3.32, Philo comments on the prohibition found in Lev 18:19 of intercourse with a menstruating woman. His argumentation is in line with that probably used by members of the second group of Essenes, those refusing to have sexual union with their pregnant wives. Philo says that one must respect the law of nature and also "remember the lesson that the generative seeds should not be wasted fruitlessly for the sake of a gross and untimely pleasure." In *Spec. Leg.* 3.34–36, this rule leads to the interdiction of intercourse with a barren woman. Those who knowingly want to marry such a woman are clearly moved by "an inordinate frenzy and incontinence

28. In Wayne A. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," *HR* 13 (1974) 165–208. Quotations from pp. 176–77.

29. Translated by Colson in LCL. Cf. Musonius in frag. 14, "Is Marriage a Handicap for the Pursuit of Philosophy?": "For, to what other purpose did the creator of mankind first divide our human race into two sexes, male and female, then implant in each a strong desire for association and union with the other [ἐπιθυμία ἰσχυρά τῆς θ' ὁμιλίας καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας], instilling . . . a powerful longing [πόθος] each for the other. . . ." The purpose is a life together, producing and rearing children together [γένεσις καὶ ὄν καὶ τρέφει] (text and trans. Lutz, *Musonius Rufus*, 92–93).

30. Translated by Colson in LCL.

[ἀκραια] past all cure." Only those who married maidens not knowing whether or not they would be able to bear children are to be pardoned when they refuse to dismiss their wives after prolonged childlessness. Otherwise, Philo remains adamant: "Those persons who make an art of quenching the life of the seed as it drops, stand confessed as the enemies of nature."

Particularly in his treatment of relations with a barren woman, it becomes clear that Philo is more radical than rabbinic tradition, as I. Heinemann³¹ and S. Belkin³² have pointed out. Marital relations were considered a biblical command, even if they were not necessary for the sake of begetting children.³³ Marriage of a priest with a sterile woman was allowed if he already had a wife or children (*m. Yebam.* 6:5).³⁴ The problem arises when a man has not fulfilled the command of Gen 1:28, that is, does not have at least two children. After he has been married to a woman who does not bear children for ten years, he has to marry another by either taking a second wife (not a common practice) or by divorcing the first one. The duty to be fruitful and multiply falls on the man, not on the woman (*m. Yebam.* 6:6). It is this duty that is under discussion, not the relation between sexual intercourse and pleasure. With regard to that matter, Philo introduced Hellenistic categories.

EARLY CHRISTIAN AUTHORS ON MARRIAGE AND PROCREATION

Hellenistic ideas about procreation as the purpose of marriage have been taken over by Christian authors from the second century onward. Relevant texts have been assembled by J. Stelzenberger,³⁵ whose crown witness among Greek theologians is Clement of Alexandria. The first authors to be mentioned in this context are, not surprisingly, a number of apologists. Justin, in *Apol.* 1.29.1, and Minucius Felix, in *Oct.* 31.5, emphasize that Christians either do not marry at all or marry only one woman in order to procreate.

31. I. Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung: Kulturvergleichende Untersuchungen zu Philons Darstellung der jüdischen Gesetze* (Breslau: H. und H. Marcus, 1929–32; repr. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchgesellschaft, 1962) 261–73.

32. S. Belkin, *Philo and the Oral Law: The Philonic Interpretation of Biblical Law in Relation to Palestinian Halakah* (HSS 11; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940) 219–22.

33. Belkin, *Philo and the Oral Law*, 219, points out that Philo is (of course) aware of this, when in *Quaest. in Gn.* 3.21 he writes about Abraham and Hagar: "For with the concubine the embrace was a bodily one for the sake of begetting children. But with the wife the union was one of the soul harmonized to heavenly love."

34. The Sages disagree with R. Judah, who equates a sterile woman with the *harkot* spoken of in *Lev* 21:7.

35. In J. Stelzenberger, *Die Beziehungen der frühchristlichen Sittenlehre zur Ethik der Stoa: Eine moralgeschichtliche Studie* (Munich: M. Hueber, 1933) 403–38 (on marriage and procreation, in Clement and other Greek theologians, see pp. 416–23). See also Preisner, *Christentum und Ehe*; Oepke, "Ehe I"; and Delling, "Geschlechtsverkehr." Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press; London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1988–89), appeared too late to be used in this chapter.

Athenagoras, in *Suppl.* 33.1–2, introduces again the topic of pleasure and lust: “Since we hope for eternal life, we despise things of this life, including even the pleasures of the soul. Thus each of us thinks of his wife, whom he married according to the laws we have laid down, with a view to nothing more than procreation. For as the farmer casts seed into the ground and awaits the harvest without further planting, so also procreation is the limit that we set for the indulgence of our lust [καὶ ἡμῖν μέτρον ἐπιθυμίας ἢ παιδοποιία].”³⁶

An illustrative example of the Christian attitude toward ἐγκράτεια (continence) and criticism of φιληδονία (love of pleasure) is found in the *Sentences* of Sextus, a document characteristic of nonsectarian Encratism also favored by Clement.³⁷ This collection of maxims no doubt had a very complicated history. H. Chadwick has argued³⁸ convincingly that it was composed by a Christian author about A.D. 180 to 210. Subtly christianizing pagan maxims (many of them characteristic of neo-Pythagorean ethics and religious piety) and at the same time “paganizing” Christian maxims, this author created a collection that could attract pagans to the Christian church, keeper of all that is true. But this collection, composed for an apologetic purpose, exercised a great influence in Christian circles, as Origen tells us.

An interesting group of sentences on marriage is formed by Sextus’s *Sentences* 230a–240.³⁹ Married people may renounce marriage in order to live as “companion to God” (230a), yet marriage is not at all forbidden: “Marry and beget children knowing that both are difficult; if you know this, as you know that a battle would be hard and that you would be brave, then marry and have children” (230b). However, restraint is called for: “Every unrestrained husband [ἀκόλαστος] commits adultery with his wife” (231) and “Do nothing for the sake of mere sensual pleasure [ψιλή ἡδονή]” (232). Wives should be modest in dress: “Let moderation [σωφροσύνη] be the normal attire of a believing wife” (234). Indeed, “A modest [σώφρων] wife is her husband’s glory” (237). Husband and wife should respect one another (238). The marriage of believers should be “a struggle for self-control [ἐγκράτεια]” (239). “As you control your stomach, so you will control your sexual desires” (240, cf. 428).

A few further sentences on ἐγκράτεια (continence) and φιληδονία (love of pleasure) complement this picture. “Self-control is the foundation of piety.

36. *Athenagoras, Legatio and De resurrectione* (ed. and trans. W. R. Schoedel; Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).

37. See H. Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus: A Contribution to the History of Early Christian Ethics* (Texts N.S. 5; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959); and R. A. Edwards and R. A. Wild, S.J., *The Sentences of Sextus* (SBLTT 22; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1981). Cf. also H. Chadwick, “Enkrateia,” *RAC* 5 (1962) 343–65.

38. See Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus*, 159–62, esp. 160: “His purpose is evident; it is to bring the moral wisdom of the Greek sages under the wing of the church, to whom all truth belongs. With adjustments here and there the language of Stoic or Pythagorean wisdom could pass in Christian circles. *Pythagoras saepe noster* might be his motto. His kindred spirit is Clement of Alexandria.”

39. See Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus*, 99–100, 172–73 (notes). The translations are from Edwards and Wild, *The Sentences of Sextus*.

The goal of piety is friendship with God" (Sextus *Sentences* 86ab); "For the sage even sleep is a matter for self-control" (253b); "Self-control is the wealth of a philosopher," and "A faithful man is nurtured in self-control" (438). Self-control and temperance are eminent virtues:

The temperate [σώφρων] man is pure in God's sight.
 Flee licentiousness [ἀκολασία].
 Exercise prudence.
 Master pleasures.
 Conquer the body in every way.
 If you love pleasure [φιληδονία], you will not escape licentiousness.
 God does not listen to one who loves pleasure.
 Luxurious living results in ruin. (67–72)⁴⁰

RACHEL'S CONTINENCY: A JEWISH OR A CHRISTIAN IDEAL?

Early Christian authors, including the person responsible for the *Sentences* of Sextus in their present form, would no doubt concur with the praise bestowed upon Rachel, Issachar, and Joseph in the *Testaments*, as well as with the criticism leveled at Reuben, Judah, and other people led away by their desires. Josephus and Philo, in their efforts to present an acceptable picture of Jewish piety and ethics to a Hellenistic audience, also would concur, as would leading Hellenistic moralists like Musonius. They, after all, exercised great influence on Hellenistic-Jewish and early Christian thinking about sexual morality. With regard to the point under discussion in this chapter, there is also a remarkable continuity in ideas between Jews and Christians living in the same Hellenistic environment.

Consequently, our investigation does not allow any conclusion with regard to the question of the origin of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The ideas about marriage expressed in the *Testament of Issachar* 2 may stem from a Jewish author and may have been taken over unaltered when the *Testaments* were adapted for use in Christian circles. They may also have been introduced into the Issachar story by Christians, either when they composed it or when they redacted an earlier Jewish testament. The *Testaments* themselves testify to the continuity in ethical thought in Hellenistic-Jewish and early Christian circles.⁴¹

40. Cf. Sextus *Sentences*, 139–40:

The body by nature causes little disturbance for the soul.
 Love of pleasure makes the body unbearable.
 Every excess is an enemy of man.

and 172: "A man full of pleasure is useless in every respect."

41. On this question, see Hollander and de Jonge, *Commentary*, 82–85; de Jonge, "Die Paränese" (n. 14); and "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Christian and Jewish: A Hundred Years after Friedrich Schnapp," *NedTTs* 39 (1985) 265–75.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS OF MARINUS DE JONGE 1953-1990

by

H.J. DE JONGE

ABBREVIATIONS

BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BiOr	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i>
CE	<i>Collected Essays</i> , the present volume, no. 18 in this bibliography
FS	Festschrift
HN	<i>Hervormd Nederland</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
KW	<i>Kerk en Wereld</i>
NAK	<i>Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis</i>
no.	number of item in this bibliography
Nov. Test.	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTT	<i>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</i>
PsVTGr	<i>Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece</i>
StVTPs	<i>Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha</i>
Suppl. Nov. Test.	<i>Supplements to Novum Testamentum</i>
TP	<i>Theologie en praktijk</i> , from 22 (1962) <i>Theologie en praktijk</i>
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
Vox Th	<i>Vox Theologica</i>
WD	<i>Woord en Dienst</i>
WNPB	<i>Weekblad van de Nederlandse Protestantenvond</i>

BOOKS

1. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition, and Origin* [dissertation Leiden 1953], Assen 1953, 184 pp. [Commercial edition:] (Van Gorcum's Theologische Bibliotheek 25), Assen 1953. 2nd edition [of the commercial edition, with a new preface], Assen 1975.
2. *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum. Edited according to Cambridge University Library MS Ff 1. 24, fol. 203a-262b, with short notes* (PsVTGr 1), Leiden 1964, 86 pp. 2nd edition [with some corrections], Leiden 1970.
3. *De toekomstverwachting in de Psalmen van Salomo* [inaugural address, Groningen, 5 October 1965], Leiden 1965, 43 pp. [for English translation, see no. 88 and CE I].
4. *De nieuwtestamentische als historicus en theoloog. Enige opmerkingen naar aanleiding van de brief van Judas* [inaugural address Leiden, 16 December 1966], Leiden 1966, 47 pp.
5. *De Brieven van Johannes* (De Prediking van het Nieuwe Testament), Nijkerk 1968, 302 pp.; 2nd revised edition, 1973, 312 pp.; 3rd enlarged edition, 1978, 324 pp.; 4th supplemented edition, 1988, 328 pp.

6. *Jezus, inspirator en spelbreker*, Nijkerk 1971, 152 pp. [for English translation, see no. 8].
7. *A Translator's Handbook on the Letters of John*, with C. Haas and J.L. Swellengrebel (Helps for Translators Series 13), London 1972, 171 pp.
8. *Jesus: Inspiring and Disturbing Presence*. Translated and edited by J.E. Steely, Nashville 1974, 176 pp. [English translation of no. 6].
9. [Seven chapters in:] M. de Jonge, ed., *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation* (StVTPs 3), Leiden 1975 [= no. 98], pp. 120-139, 144-160, 174-179, 183-192, 193-246 [= no. 23], 247-260 [= no. 52], 291-316.
10. *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God. Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective* (Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study 11), Missoula 1977, 236 pp.
11. *Taal en Tekenen. Ontmoetingen met Jezus in het evangelie van Johannes*, with H.M.J. van Duyn, Nijkerk 1978, 152 pp.
12. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. In cooperation with H.W. Hollander, H.J. de Jonge and Th. Korteweg (PsVTGr I,2), Leiden 1978, 251 pp.
13. *Van tekst tot uitleg. Luisteroefeningen in het Nieuwe Testament*, with H.M.J. van Duyn, The Hague 1982, 152 pp.
14. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*, with H.W. Hollander (StVTPs 8), Leiden 1985, 469 pp.
15. *Christology in Context. The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus*, Philadelphia 1988, 276 pp.
16. *Jesus, the Servant-Messiah*, New Haven 1991 [for Dutch translation, see no. 17].
17. *Jezus als Messias. Hoe Hij zijn zending zag*, Bostel/Bruges 1990, 128 pp. [Dutch translation of no. 16].
18. *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Collected Essays* (Suppl. Nov. Test.), Leiden 1991 [= CE, the present volume].

SCHOLARLY ARTICLES

19. 'Enige recente studies over het leven van Jezus,' *TP* 15 (1955), 97-111.
20. 'Vreemdelingen en bijwoners. Enige opmerkingen naar aanleiding van 1 Petr. 2:11 en verwante teksten,' *NTT* 11 (1956-57), 18-36.
21. 'Nieuwe bijdragen tot de *Leben-Jesu-Forschung* in Duitsland,' *VoxTh* 29 (1958-59), 129-144.
22. 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the New Testament,' in: K. Aland et alii, edd., *Studia Evangelica* (Texte und Untersuchungen 73), Berlin 1959, 546-556.
23. 'Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *Nov. Test.* 4 (1960), 182-235 [reprinted in no. 9, pp. 193-246].
24. 'Christelijke elementen in de *Vitae Prophetarum*,' *NTT* 16 (1961-62), 161-178.
25. 'Once more: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *Nov. Test.* 5 (1962), 311-319.
26. 'Bultmann en Ebeling,' *TP* 24 (1964), 70-86.
27. 'The Greek Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,' with A.-M. Denis, *Nov. Test.* 7 (1965), 319-328.
28. '11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament,' with A.S. van der Woude, *NTS* 12 (1965-66), 301-326.
29. 'Philemon,' 'Philemonbrief' and 'Tychikus,' in: B. Reicke and L. Rost, edd., *Biblisch-Historisches Handwörterbuch*, III, Göttingen 1966, col. 1451, 2034-2035.

30. 'The Use of the Word "Anointed" in the Time of Jesus,' *Nov. Test.* 8 (1966), 132-148.
31. 'De berichten over het scheuren van het voorhangsel bij Jezus' dood in de synoptische evangeliën,' *NTT* 21 (1966-67), 90-114.
32. 'Het motief van het gescheurde voorhangsel van de tempel in een aantal vroeg-christelijke geschriften,' *NTT* 21 (1966-67), 257-276.
33. 'Twelve Patriarchs, Testaments of the,' *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 22, Chicago/London etc. 1967, p. 427.
34. 'De traditie en Jezus,' *TP* 27 (1967), 1-18 [= Chapter 6 in no. 6].
35. "'Geliefden, laten wij elkander liefhebben, want de liefde is uit God" (1 Joh. 4:7),' *NTT* 22 (1967-68), 352-367 [= Chapter 8 in no. 6].
36. 'Theologie als hermeneutiek,' *Rondom het Woord* 9 (1967), 101-116; reprinted in: G.C. Berkouwer and A.S. van der Woude, edd., *Revolte in de theologie*, Nijkerk 1968, 74-89.
37. 'Wie zijn "wij"? Enige beschouwingen over het gebruik van de eerste persoon meervoud in het evangelie en de eerste brief van Johannes,' *TP* 28 (1968-69), 169-180 [= first part of Chapter 11 in no. 6].
38. 'De discussie in Duitsland rondom de opstanding van Jezus,' *VoxTh* 38 (1968), 105-131.
39. 'The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future according to the Qumran Scrolls,' in: O. Michel *et alii*, edd., *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, Assen 1969, 44-63 [= CE II].
40. 'The Use of the Word *Christos* in the Johannine Epistles,' in: *Studies in John* (FS J.N. Sevenster) (Suppl. Nov. Test. 24), Leiden 1970, 66-74.
41. 'Nicodemus and Jesus: Some Observations on Misunderstanding and Understanding in the Fourth Gospel' [Manson Memorial Lecture, Manchester, 26 October 1970], *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 53 (1971), 337-359 [= Chapter 2 in no. 10].
42. 'Recent Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 36 (1971), 77-96.
43. 'A Translator's Handbook on the Letters of John,' with C. Haas and J.L. Swellengrebel, *The Bible Translator* 22 (1971), 11-18.
44. 'Messianisme in het Jodendom en het vroege Christendom,' *TP* 32 (1972), 50-61.
45. 'Jewish Expectations about the "Messiah" according to the Fourth Gospel,' *NTS* 19 (1972-73), 246-270 [= Chapter 4 in no. 10].
46. 'Ontwikkelingen binnen de Johanneïsche theologie,' *VoxTh* 43 (1973), 205-226.
47. 'Jesus as Prophet and King in the Fourth Gospel,' *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 49 (1973), 160-177 [= Chapter 3 in no. 10].
48. 'Onbegrip in Jeruzalem: Jezus en "de Joden" in Johannes 7,' *Rondom het Woord* 15 (1973), 61-80.
49. [*chríoo*, *christos*, usw. in den alttestamentlichen Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen], in: G. Friedrich, ed., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, IX, Stuttgart/Berlin, etc. 1973, pp. 502-508; [eadem voces bei Philo und Josephus], *ibidem*, pp. 511-512. [English translation in:] *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, IX, Grand Rapids 1974, pp. 511-517 and 520-521.
50. 'Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes,' in: O. Betz, K. Haacker, M. Hengel, edd., *Josephus-Studien* (FS O. Michel), Göttingen 1974, 205-219 [= CE III].
51. 'Johanneïsche notities bij Berkhof's christologie,' in: *Weerwoord. Reacties op dr H. Berkhof's "Christelijk Geloof"*, Nijkerk 1974, 116-126.
52. 'Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII,' in: M.S.H.G. Heerma van Voss *et alii*, edd., *Travels in the World of the Old Testament* (FS M.A. Beek), Assen 1974, 132-145 [reprinted in no. 9, pp. 247-260].

53. 'The New Testament [as a source for the history of Judaism in the first century C.E.], in: S. Safrai, M. Stern *et alii*, ed., *The Jewish People in the First Century*, I (Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section One), Assen 1974, 37-43.
54. 'Ethiek in de tussentijd. Enige notities over de verhouding van parenese, geloof en verwachting in het evangelie en de eerste brief van Johannes,' in: T. Baarda *et alii*, *Ad Interim* (FS R. Schippers), Kampen 1975, 43-60 [English translation in no. 10, Chapter 7, pp. 169-191].
55. 'The Use of *ho Christos* in the Passion Narratives,' in: J. Dupont, ed., *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (BETL 40), Gembloux/Leuven 1975; 2nd edition 1989, 169-192 [= CE IV].
56. 'Een analyse van I Johannes 1,1-4,' in: B.M.F. van Iersel, M. de Jonge, J. Nelis, ed., *Van Taal tot Taal* (FS W.K. Grossouw) (Annalen van het Thijmgenootschap 65,3), Baarn 1977, 33-45 [cf. no. 57].
57. 'An Analysis of I John 1:1-4,' *The Bible Translator* 29 (1978), 322-330 [cf. no. 56].
58. 'God, goed en kwaad in Johannes 3:19-21,' in: *God, goed en kwaad* (FS H.J. Heering), The Hague 1977, 85-92.
59. 'Gods Zoon en Gods kinderen,' *Rondom het Woord* 18 (1976), 57-73 [for English translation, see no. 60].
60. 'The Son of God and the Children of God in the Fourth Gospel,' in: J.I. Cook, ed., *Saved by Hope* (FS R.C. Oudersluys), Grand Rapids 1978, 44-63 [= no. 10, Chapter 6, pp. 141-168; translation of no. 59].
61. 'Signs and Works in the Fourth Gospel,' in: T. Baarda, A.F.J. Klijn, W.C. van Unnik, ed., *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, II (Suppl. Nov. Test. 48), Leiden 1978, 107-125 [= no. 10, Chapter 5, pp. 117-140].
62. 'The Beloved Disciple and the Date of the Gospel of John,' in: E. Best and R. McL. Wilson, ed., *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*, Cambridge/New York 1979, 99-114.
63. 'Some Remarks in Connection with a Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letters to the Thessalonians,' *The Bible Translator* 30 (1979), 127-135.
64. 'Again: "To Stretch out the Feet" in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980), 120-121.
65. 'The Use of the Expression *ho christos* in the Apocalypse of John,' in: J. Lambrecht, ed., *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (BETL 53), Gembloux/Leuven 1980, 267-281 [= CE V].
66. 'The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *NTS* 26 (1980), 508-524 [= CE IX].
67. 'Levi, the Sons of Levi and the Law in Testament Levi X, XIV-XV and XVI,' in: J. Doré, P. Grelot, M. Carrez, ed., *De la Tòrah au Messie. Mélanges H. Cazelles*, Tournai 1981, 513-523 [= CE XI].
68. 'De historisch-kritische methode,' in: A.F.J. Klijn, ed., *Inleiding tot de studie van het Nieuwe Testament*, Kampen 1982, 2nd edition [1986], 71-85.
69. 'A New Type of Help for Translators,' with H.W. Hollander and E.W. Tuinstra, *The Biblical Translator* 35 (1984), 341-346.
70. 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' [translated from the Greek], in: H.F.D. Sparks, ed., *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, Oxford 1984, 515-600.
71. 'The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus,' *VC* 39 (1985), 157-170 [= CE XVII].
72. 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Christian and Jewish. A hundred years after Friedrich Schnapp,' *NTT* 39 (1985), 265-275 [= CE XV].
73. 'The Psalms of Solomon,' in: M. de Jonge, ed., *Outside the Old Testament* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200, vol. 4), Cambridge 1985 [= no. 101], 159-177.

74. 'Hippolytus' "Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses" and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 245-260 [= CE XIII].
75. 'Two Interesting Interpretations of the Rending of the Temple-Veil in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), 350-362 [= CE XIV].
76. 'De structuur van te vertalen teksten,' in: H.W. Hollander and E.W. Tuinstra, edd., *Bijbel vertalen. Liefhebberij of wetenschap?*, Haarlem 1985, 74-87.
77. 'The Earliest Christian Use of *Christos*: Some Suggestions' [Presidential Address for the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, 1985], *NTS* 32 (1986), 321-343 [= CE VI].
78. 'Matthew 27:51 in Early Christian Exegesis,' in: G.W.E. Nickelsburg and G.W. MacRae, edd., *Christians among Jews and Gentiles* (= *Harvard Theological Review* 79 [1986]), Philadelphia 1986, 67-79.
79. 'The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *JSJ* 17 (1986), 196-211 [= CE X].
80. 'Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?,' in: J.W. van Henten, H.J. de Jonge *et alii*, edd., *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (FS J.C.H. Lebram) (Studia Post-Biblica 36), Leiden 1986, 150-162 [= CE XII].
81. 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints,' in: W. Haase, H. Temporini, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II, 20,1, Berlin/New York 1987, 359-420.
82. 'Jezus als profetische Zoon van David,' in: F. García Martínez, C.H.J. de Geus, A.F.J. Klijn, edd., *Profeten en profetische geschriften* (FS A.S. van der Woude), Kampen/Nijkerk 1987, 157-166.
83. 'Het evangelie naar Johannes en de brieven van Johannes,' in: A.S. van der Woude *et alii*, edd., *Bijbels Handboek*, III, Kampen 1987, 294-315.
84. 'The Testament of Levi and "Aramaic Levi",' *Revue de Qumran*, nos. 49-52, tome 13 (1988), 367-385 [= CE XVI].
85. 'Jesus' Death for Others and the Death of the Maccabean Martyrs,' in: T. Baarda, A. Hilhorst *et alii*, edd., *Text and Testimony* (FS A.F.J. Klijn), Kampen 1988, pp. 142-151 [= CE VII].
86. 'Die Paränese in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und in den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen,' in: H. Merklein, ed., *Neues Testament und Ethik* (FS R. Schnackenburg), Freiburg/Basel/Wien 1989, 538-550 [= CE XVIII].
87. 'Test. Benjamin 3:8 and the Picture of Joseph as a "Good and Holy Man",' in: J.W. van Henten, ed., *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (Studia Post-Biblica 38), Leiden 1989, 204-214 [= CE XIX].
88. 'The Expectation of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon,' *Neotestamentica* 23 (1989), 93-117 [translation of no. 3 by P.G.R. de Villiers, with additional comments; = CE I].
89. 'Ter inleiding' [introduction] and 'De hoofdzaken' [epilogue] in: F.O. van Gennep, M. de Jonge *et alii*, *Waarlijk opgestaan! Een discussie over de opstanding van Jezus Christus*, Baarn 1989, 7-8 and 74-83.
90. 'Robert Grosseteste (1170-1253) en de Testamenten van de Twaalf Patriarchen,' in: E. de Bijll Nachenius *et aliae*, edd., *Heimwee naar de Middeleeuwen* (FS F.F.F.-Nemo S.S.S.), Leiden 1989, 64-74.
91. 'Jesus, Son of David and Son of God,' in: S. Draisma, ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings* (FS B.M.F. van Iersel), Kampen 1989, 95-104 [= CE VIII].
92. 'Rachel's Virtuous Behavior in the Testament of Issachar,' in: D. Balch *et alii*, edd., *Greeks, Romans and Christians* (FS A.J. Malherbe), Minneapolis 1990, 340-352 [= CE XX].

EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITY

93. Member of the Dutch Bible Society committee for the translation of the New Testament into contemporary Dutch, 1962-1973. M. de Jonge shared in the following translations:
- Een gevangene schrift* [Philip., Phlmn], Amsterdam/Haarlem [ca. 1963].
 - Licht* [Gospel of John], Amsterdam/Haarlem 1964, 3rd edition 1977.
 - Vaart* [Acts], Amsterdam/Haarlem 1965.
 - Houvast* [Catholic Epistles], Amsterdam/Haarlem 1969.
 - Vrij!* [Luke], Amsterdam/Haarlem 1970.
 - Waar!* [Matthew], Amsterdam/Haarlem 1973.
94. *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece*, with A.-M. Denis, Leiden, vol. I, 1964 - vol. IV, 1977 . . .
95. *Inleiding tot de theologische studie*, with W.F. Dankbaar, Groningen 1965, 258 pp.
96. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha*, with A.-M. Denis, Leiden, vol. I, 1969 - vol. VIII, 1985 . . .
97. General editor, with S. Safrai, of *The Jewish People in the First Century*, I-II, edited by S. Safrai, M. Stern *et alii* (Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum), Assen/Amsterdam 1974, 1976.
98. *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation* (StVTPs 3), Leiden 1975, 329 pp. [cf. no. 9].
99. *Van Taal tot Taal* (FS W.K. Grossouw), with B.M.F. van Iersel and J. Nelis (Annalen van het Thijmgenootschap 65,3), Baarn 1977, 211 pp.
100. *L'Évangile de Jean. Sources, rédaction, théologie* (BETL 44), Gembloux/Leuven 1977.
101. *Outside the Old Testament* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200, vol. 4), Cambridge 1985, 263 pp. Also author of the 'General Introduction,' pp. 1-5.
102. *Theologie en Practijk* 14 (1954) - 34 (1974). [From 22 (1962): *Theologie en Praktijk*].
103. *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 1 (1970) - 20 (1989) . . .
104. *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 29 (1975) - 40 (1986).

A SELECTION OF POPULARIZING AND NON-SPECIALIST ARTICLES

105. 'Why theology is indispensable,' *The Woodbrooke International Journal* 65 (1953), 8-9.
106. '[Chapter] IV. Het Nieuwe Testament,' in: M. de Jonge, P.H. Kapteyn, K.M. Witteveen, edd., *Op vaste grond. Leidraad bij de bezinning op de inhoud van het christelijk geloof*, Assen 1955, 27-39.
107. 'Portret van Wedde,' *WNPB* 14 (1955), 36, p. 3
108. 'De lijdensverhalen in het evangelie van Johannes,' *WNPB* 15 (1956), 7, p. 2; 8, p. 2; 9, p. 2; 10, p. 2; 11, p. 2; 12, p. 2.
109. 'De opstandingsverhalen in het evangelie van Johannes,' *WNPB* 15 (1956), 13, p. 2; 14, p. 2; 15, p. 2.
110. 'Nieuw-testamentische uitspraken over de kerk,' *WNPB* 15 (1956), issues 16-24, in each issue on p. 2.
111. 'De Brief van Jacobus,' *WNPB* 15 (1956), issues 25-30, in each issue on p. 2.
112. 'De Brief aan de Galaten,' *WNPB* 15 (1956), issues 31-35, in each issue on p. 2.
113. 'Het christendom,' in: 'De godsdienst,' in: *A.N.S.I.E.* [= *Algemene Nederlandse Systematisch Ingerichte Encyclopedie*], vol. II, Amsterdam 1956, 807-815.

114. 'Twee nieuwe boeken over het Evangelie van Johannes,' *TP* 16 (1956), 112-121.
115. 'Litteratuur over het Nieuwe Testament,' *TP* 17 (1957), 136-141.
116. 'Het leven uit de Geest,' *HN* 13 (1957), 24, p. 3; 25, p. 3; 26, p. 3; 27, p. 3; 29, p. 3; 30, p. 3.
117. 'De historische achtergrond van de kerstverhalen,' *WNPB* 17 (1958), Christmas-number, pp. 4-5.
118. 'Wat zegt het Nieuwe Testament over de verzoening?,' *KW* 51 (1959), 11, pp. 1-2.
119. 'Oscar Cullmanns *Christologie des Neuen Testaments*,' *TP* 19 (1959), 1-12.
120. 'H.J. Schoeps' visie op Paulus,' *TP* 19 (1959), 121-139.
121. 'De historische achtergrond van de paasverhalen,' *WNPB* 18 (1959), 12, p. 3.
122. 'Het richtingsvraagstuk,' *KW* 51 (1959), 6, p. 1.
123. 'Albert Schweitzers opvattingen aangaande het leven van Jezus,' *KW* 52 (1960), 17, pp. 5-6.
124. 'Judas Iskariot, de verrader,' *Homiletica en biblica* 18 (1959), pp. 149-156, 178-181; 19 (1960), pp. 4-10, 38-45, 69-80.
125. 'Hoe zien wij de Bijbel nu?,' *KW* 52 (1960), 3, pp. 4-5; 4, pp. 5-6.
126. 'De "bruikbaarheid" van de bijbel,' *KW* 52 (1960), 8, pp. 5-6.
127. 'Joh. 18:33-38. "Wat is waarheid?"', *Uilenspiegel* 6 (1960), 5, pp. 4-5.
128. 'Romeinen 13:1-7,' *Militia Christi*. Orgaan van Kerk en vrede 16 (1961), 8, pp. 61-63; 9, pp. 69-71; 12, pp. 93-94.
129. 'Nog eens Romeinen 13,' *Militia Christi*. Orgaan van Kerk en vrede 16 (1961), 16, pp. 128-129.
130. 'Wat is waarheid?,' *WNPB* 20 (1961), 14, p. 5; 15, p. 5; 16, p. 3; 17, p. 5.
131. 'Het gesprek tussen "Rechts" en "Links",' *HN* 17 (1961), 35, p. 61.
132. 'Verkenning van het Nieuwe Testament,' [four contributions to] *Toerusting-les*, [series:] De bijbel, issues 7-10, Driebergen (De Horst) 1961, 16 pp.
133. 'Leven uit de Geest,' *Mededelingen der Barchembeweging* 37 (1963), 5-20.
134. 'Het kerkelijk gesprek en het gesprek tussen kerk en wereld,' *TP* 23 (1963), 76-92 [= Ch. II in no. 6; cf. no. 8].
135. 'Zoeken naar een moderne christologie' [on J.A.T. Robinson's *Honest to God*], *Wending* 18 (1963-64), 758-770 [= Ch. IV in no. 6; cf. no. 8].
136. 'Enkele bijbelse notities' [on the laity in the Church], *Mededelingen der Barchembeweging* 38 (1964), 1-6 [= no. 6, pp. 136-140].
137. [Several contributions to:] M. de Jonge and A.S. van der Woude, *De bevrijdende God. Acht bijbelbesprekingen*, Driebergen 1964, 2nd edition [1977?], 30 pp.
138. 'De vraag naar de mens Jezus van Nazareth,' *Wending* 19 (1964-65), 718-732 [= Ch. III in no. 6].
139. 'Catechiseren met het evangelie van Johannes,' *TP* 24 (1964-65), 166-179.
140. 'Tafelgesprek over 1 Corinthiërs 11,' and 'Tafelgesprek over een avondmaals-verantwoording,' with R. Hensen, in: *Eten en drinken. 8 radiouitzendingen over het avondmaal*, Hilversum (V.P.R.O.) 1965, pp. 17-20, 23-26.
141. 'Jezus als mens onder mensen,' *TP* 25 (1965-66), 198-212 [= Ch. V in no. 6].
142. 'De apostel Paulus, dienaar van Christus Jezus en leerling van Gamaliël,' *Wending* 21 (1966), 544-557.
143. 'Communications in Words and in Silence,' *The Friends' Quarterly* 15 (1966), 268-276 [for Dutch translation, see no. 144].
144. 'Communicatie in spreken en zwijgen,' *Mededelingen der Barchembeweging* 41 (1967), 6-12 [Dutch translation of no. 143; = Ch. VII in no. 6].
145. 'Het historisch-kritisch onderzoek van de bijbel,' *WD* 16 (1967), p. 227.
146. 'Bijbelvertalen in hedendaags Nederlands,' *KW* 60 (1968), 11, pp. 5-6; 13, pp. 2-3.
147. 'Nooit klaar met bijbelvertalen,' *WD* 17 (1968), p. 135.

148. 'Levende traditie,' *Peiling* (1968), number four ['vierde kwartaal'], pp. 5-8.
149. 'Uitbouwen en experimenteren,' with J.H. Jimmink, *Mededelingen der Barchem-beweging* 42 (1968), 16-27.
150. 'Een "ambtenpatroon" in het Nieuwe Testament?,' *WD* 18 (1969), p. 232.
151. 'Een nieuw boek over Jezus Christus' [on E. Schweizer, *Jesus Christus im vielfältigen Zeugnis des Neuen Testaments*, München/Hamburg 1968], *KW* 61 (1969), 13, pp. 2-3.
152. [Three homiletic sketches, on 1 John 4:2-3a, 4:11 and 4:16b, in:] *Postille 1969-1970*, [under the auspices of the] Werkgroep Kerk en Prediking, The Hague 1969, 151-160; [reprinted in:] M.H. Bolkestein, K. Strijd, edd., *Keus uit Twaalf Postillen*, The Hague 1976, 140-148.
153. 'Vertalen een voortdurende opdracht,' *KW* 62 (1970), 7, p. 5.
154. 'Dynamisch equivalent vertalen II,' *Rondom het Woord* 12 (1970), 4, pp. 421-425.
155. 'David Flusser over Jezus,' *KW* 62 (1970), 13, p. 7.
156. 'Steeds weer nieuw vertalen,' *Benediktijns tijdschrift* 31 (1970), 97-103.
157. 'De dood in de bijbel,' in: H. Faber, ed., *Over dood en sterven*, Leiden 1971, 53-60.
158. 'Pseudepigrafie in de joodse literatuur van ca. 200 v.C. - 100 n.C.,' in: J. Bakkenhoven, ed., *De bijbel* 4, 64 (1972), 2045-2046.
159. 'De titel "Christus",' in: J. Bakkenhoven, ed., *De bijbel* 5, 77 (1972), 2433-2434.
160. 'Het evangelie van Johannes,' in: J. Bakkenhoven, ed., *De bijbel* 6, 81 (1972), 2586-2587.
161. 'De gemeenten van Johannes,' in: J. Bakkenhoven, ed., *De bijbel* 6, 93 (1972), 2975.
162. [Participant in:] 'Symposium on Christian Origins: Banquet Discussion,' *The Duke Divinity School Review* 37 (1972), 133-145.
163. 'Leven uit liefde, met beide benen op de grond,' *Getuigenis* 17 (1972-73), 173-177.
164. 'Ontmoetingen met Jezus in het evangelie van Johannes,' *TP* 33 (1973), 153-163.
165. 'Maria van Magdala in het vierde evangelie,' *HN* 32 (1976), 16, p. 15.
166. 'Bevrijding en opdracht,' *Getuigenis* 21 (1976-77), 113-118.
167. 'Geïntensiveerde verwachting,' *Remonstrants Weekblad* 36 (1977), 25, pp. 6, 10.
168. 'Het hart op de tong. Doorvertalen van het Christelijk geloof,' *KW* 70 (1978), 8, p. 5.
169. [Two homiletic sketches entitled:] 'Themadienst I, Galaten 1:1' and 'Themadienst II, Marcus 1:1,' in: *Postille 1978-1979*, [under the auspices of the] Werkgroep Kerk en Prediking, The Hague 1978, 209-215.
170. 'Christelijke exegese of exegese door christenen?,' *Articuli. Thomistisch tijdschrift voor geloof en wetenschap* 5 (1979), 4-19.
171. 'Ter Schegget en Paulus,' *In de Waagschaal* 8 (1979), 61-64.
172. 'Joodse en vroegchristelijke toekomstverwachting,' in: A. van Houwelingen et alii, edd., *Theologie en toekomst* (FS F.F.F. - Nemo S.S.S.), Leiden 1979, 14-18.
173. 'Lucas als componist en theoloog,' *WD* 28 (1979), 331; 'Lucas naast Marcus en Matteüs,' *ibidem*, 347; 'Lucas en de armen,' *ibidem* 374; 'Lucas en de zondaren,' *ibidem*, p. 387.
174. 'Jezus' woorden bij de laatste maaltijd,' *WD* 29 (1980), 59-60; 'Arrestatie, veroordeling en kruisiging,' *ibidem*, 77-78; 'Zicht op opstanding en zending,' *ibidem*, 118-119.
175. 'Jezus, de Zoon van de Vader,' *Wending* 35 (1980), 471-476, 530-540.
176. 'Johannes 6: "Het echte brood uit de hemel wordt U door mijn Vader gegeven",' *Getuigenis* 26 (1981-82), 195-201.

177. 'Paulus' uitspraken over de Doop in Romeinen 6:1-14,' in: Raad van kerken, ed., *Oecumenische Doopkatechese. Een handreiking voor catechisanten en catechisanten*, Amersfoort 1982, 15-17.
178. 'De structuur van de tekst,' with J.J. van Capelleveen, *Met andere woorden* 4 (1985), 1, pp. 13-14.
179. 'In memoriam prof. dr. G. Sevenster,' *Mare*, 12 september 1985, p. 16.
180. 'In memoriam prof. dr. G. Sevenster,' *WD* 34 (1985), 19, p. 411.
181. *Het Nieuwe Testament en Twaalf andere Testamenten*. Rede ter gelegenheid van de 411e diesviering van de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, Leiden 1986, 22 pp.
182. 'De Testamenten van de Twaalf Patriarchen,' in: Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, *Jaarverslag 1985*, Leiden [1986], 13-16 [abridged version of no. 181].
183. 'Banning, leidsman op de weg naar vernieuwing,' *Barchembladen* 18 (March 1988), 4-6.
184. 'Enige korte notities bij J. Nauta, "Flexibele gemeentevormen in de eerste eeuw",' in: J.P. Heering et alii, edd., *De kerk verbouwen. Dingemans' ecclesiologie kritisch bekeken* (Leidse Lezingen 3), Nijkerk 1989, 29-30.
185. 'Paulus en de hellenistische wereld,' *WD* 38 (1989), 19, pp. 371-372.

A SELECTION OF BOOK REVIEWS

186. C.H. Lindijer, *Het lijden in het Nieuwe Testament*, Amsterdam 1956, in: *TP* 17 (1957), 144-145.
187. D. van Swighem, *Het missionair karakter van de christelijke gemeente volgens de brieven van Paulus en Petrus*, Kampen 1955, in: *TP* 17 (1957), 80-82.
188. J. de Graaf, *In gesprek met de bergrede*, The Hague 1957, in: *TP* 18 (1958), 119.
189. G.J. Sirks, *Spoorzoeken in het Nieuwe Testament*, Arnhem 1957, in: *TP* 18 (1958), 66-70.
190. E. Barnikol, *Das Leben Jesu der Heilsgeschichte*, Halle 1958, in: *VoxTh* 29 (1958-59), 161-162; 'Dupliek' [on Barnikol's response], *VoxTh* 30 (1959-60), 181.
191. R. Guardini, *De menselijke werkelijkheid van de Heer*, Bussum 1958, in: *VoxTh* 29 (1958-59), 162-163.
192. H.H. Jensen, *Der historische Jesus*, Halle 1957, in: *VoxTh* 29 (1958-59), 163.
193. J.M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, London 1959, in: *VoxTh* 29 (1958-59), 163-164.
194. A.J.B. Higgins, ed., *New Testament Essays. Studies in memory of Thomas Walter Manson, 1893-1958*, Manchester 1959, in: *Journal of Theological Studies* 11 (1960), 131-133.
195. E. Fuchs, *Zum hermeneutischen Problem in der Theologie*, Tübingen 1959, in: *VoxTh* 30 (1959-60), 147-148.
196. J.M. de Jong, *Kerygma. Een onderzoek naar de vooronderstellingen van de theologie van Rudolf Bultmann*, Assen 1958, in: *NTT* 13 (1959), 453-456.
197. C.P. van Andel, *De structuur van de Henoch-traditie en het Nieuwe Testament*, Utrecht 1955, in: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1958, Nr. 2, cols. 114-115.
198. G. Schneider, *Kernprobleme des Christentums*, Stuttgart 1959, in: *TP* 19 (1959), 162-164.
199. E. Fuchs, *Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus*, Tübingen 1960, in: *VoxTh* 31 (1960-61), 161-162.
200. E.D. O'Connor, *Faith in the Synoptic Gospels*, Notre Dame 1961, in: *NTT* 15 (1961), 459-460.
201. E. Lövestam, *Son and Saviour. A Study of Acts 13, 13-37*, Lund/Copenhagen 1961; B.M.F. van Iersel, 'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten, Leiden 1961, in: *VoxTh* 33 (1962-63), 127-128.

202. A.W. Cramer, *Stoicheia tou kosmou*, Nieuwkoop 1961, in: *TP* 23 (1963), 99-101.
203. J.J. Meuzelaar, *Der Leib des Messias*, Assen 1961, in: *TP* 23 (1963), 101-104.
204. R. Bohren, ed., *Einführung in das Studium der Evangelischen Theologie*, München 1964, in: *NAK* 47 (1965-66), 38-39.
205. J. de Vuyst, "Oud en nieuw verbond" in de brief aan de Hebreëen, Kampen 1964, in: *TP* 25 (1965), 41-42.
206. R.C.M. Ruys, *De structuur van de Brief aan de Romeinen*, Utrecht/Nimwegen 1964, *TP* 25 (1965), 42-43.
207. A.J. Bronkhorst, *De geschiedenis van Israel van Alexander de Grote tot Bar Kochba*, Baarn 1964, in: *NTT* 19 (1964-65), 314-315.
208. D. Flusser, *De joodse oorsprong van het christendom. Twee essays*, Amsterdam 1964, in: *NTT* 19 (1964-65), 315-316.
209. K. Schubert, ed., *Vom Messias zum Christus. Die Fülle der Zeit in religionsgeschichtlicher und theologischer Sicht*, Vienna/Freiburg/Basel 1964, in: *NTT* 21 (1966), 50-51.
210. C. Burchard, *Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth*, Tübingen 1965, in: *NTT* 21 (1966-67), 134-136.
211. J.Y. Campbell, *Three New Testament Studies*, Leiden 1965, in: *NTT* 21 (1966-67), 136-137.
212. T. Boman, *Die Jesus-Überlieferung im Lichte der neueren Volkskunde*, Göttingen 1967, in: *NTT* 23 (1969), 457-460.
213. H. Freiherr von Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*, Tübingen 1968, in *NAK* 51 (1970), 93-96.
214. S.G.F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, Manchester 1967, in: *VC* 23 (1969), 228-231.
215. T. Boman, *Gemeindebildungen im Neuen Testament*, Göttingen 1969, in: *NTT* 24 (1970), 394.
216. C. Burger, *Jesus als Davidsohn*, Göttingen 1970, in: *NTT* 25 (1971), 209-211.
217. A. Ehrhardt, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Manchester 1969, in: *NTT* 25 (1971), 211-212.
218. G. Theissen, *Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief*, Gütersloh 1969, in: *NTT* 25 (1971), 212-214.
219. G. Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, Cambridge 1970, in: *NTT* 25 (1971), 456-458.
220. D.W. Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*, Basel 1970, in: *NTT* 25 (1971), 458.
221. R.T. Fortna, *The Gospel of Signs*, London 1970, in: *NTT* 26 (1972), 91-94.
222. T.E. Pollard, *Johannine Christology and the Early Church*, Cambridge 1970, in: *NTT* 26 (1972), 94-96.
223. J. Reumann, *Jesus in the Church's Gospels*, London 1970, in: *NTT* 26 (1972), 398-399.
224. J.T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns*, Cambridge 1971, in: *NTT* 26 (1972), 399-401.
225. F.F. Bruce, *The Epistles of John*, London 1970, in: *The Bible Translator* 23 (1972), 348.
226. C. Burchard, J. Jervell, J. Thomas, *Studien zu den Testamenten der zwölf Patriarchen*, Berlin 1969, in: *VC* 26 (1972) 146-148.
227. G. Stemberger, *La symbolique du bien et du mal selon Saint Jean*, Paris 1970, in: *VC* 26 (1972), 301-302.
228. C. de Beus, *Johannes' getuigenis van het Woord*, Nijkerk 1973, in: *NTT* 28 (1974), 172-173.
229. J. P. Miranda, *Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den johanneischen Sendungsformeln, zugleich ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Christologie und Ekklesiologie*, Bern/Frankfurt am Main 1972, in: *NTT* 29 (1975), 68-69.
230. J. Beutler, *Martyria. Traditions geschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Zeugnisthema bei*

- Johannes, Frankfurt am Main 1972, in: *NTT* 29 (1975), 70-71.
231. G. Reim, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannes-evangeliums*, Cambridge 1974, in: *NTT* 29 (1975), 71-72.
232. R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man. A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*, Cambridge 1973, in: *NTT* 29 (1975), 72-75.
233. G. van Belle, *De Semeia-bron in het vierde evangelie*, Leuven 1975, in: *NTT* 30 (1976), 225-226.
234. Ph. Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin/New York 1975, in: *NTT* 30 (1976), 333-334.
235. M. Hooker and C. Hickling, edd., *What about the New Testament? Essays in Honour of Christopher Evans*, London 1975, in: *NTT* 30 (1976), 334-335.
236. J.C. O'Neill, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, Harmondsworth 1975, in: *NTT* 30 (1976), 336-337.
237. L. Goppelt, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, I, Göttingen 1975, in: *NTT* 31 (1977), 64-66.
238. P. A. Elderenbosch, *Het onderricht van de Messias. Aantekeningen bij het Evangelie van Johannes*, The Hague 1976, in: *NTT* 31 (1977), 243-247.
239. R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*. III, Freiburg/Basel/Vienna 1975, in: *NTT* 31 (1977), 160-161.
240. O. Cullmann, *Le milieu johannique*, Neuchâtel/Paris 1976, in: *NTT* 31 (1977), 161-163.
241. J.-A. Bühner, *Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium*, Tübingen 1977, in: *NTT* 32 (1978), 318-325.
242. H.E. Faber van der Meulen, *Das Salomo-Bild im hellenistisch-jüdischen Schrifttum*, Kampen 1978, in: *JSJ* 9 (1978), 219-220.
243. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Studies on the Testament of Abraham*, Missoula 1976, in: *JSJ* 9 (1978), 228-230.
244. A.L. Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of IV Ezra*, Missoula 1977, in: *JSJ* 9 (1978), 235-237.
245. J.C. Vanderkam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, Missoula 1977, in: *JSJ* 9 (1978), 237-238.
246. F. Schnider, *Jesus der Prophet*, Freiburg/Göttingen 1973, in: *BiOr* 35 (1978), 438-439.
247. H.D. Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*, Missoula 1977, in: *JSJ* 9 (1978), 108-111.
248. M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille, *L'évangile de Jean. Synopse des quatre évangiles en français*, tome III, Paris 1977, in: *BiOr* 36 (1979), 110-111.
249. T. Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society. A Study of 2 Peter*, Lund 1977, in: *NTT* 33 (1979), 144-145.
250. L. Goppelt, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, II, Göttingen 1976, in: *NTT* 33 (1979), 145-147.
251. L. Goppelt, *Der erste Petrusbrief*, Göttingen 1978, in: *NTT* 33 (1979), 242-243.
252. D. Lührmann, *Der Brief an die Galater*, Zürich 1978; V. Hasler, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*, Zürich 1978, in: *NTT* 33 (1979), 243-244.
253. P. Krijbolder, *Jezus de Nazoreeër. Een studie over de historiciteit van Jezus en de oorsprong van het christendom*, Amsterdam 1976, in: *NTT* 33 (1979), 248-250.
254. A. Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*, I, Uppsala 1977, in: *JSJ* 10 (1979), 100-102.
255. J. Becker, *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*, Gütersloh 1980, in: *JSJ* 11 (1980), 95-96.
256. P. Grelot, *L'espérance juive à l'heure de Jésus*, Paris 1978, in: *JSJ* 11 (1980), 99-100.
257. S. Westerholm, *Jesus and Scribal Authority*, Lund 1978, in: *JSJ* 11 (1980), 116-117.

258. M.E. Stone and J. Strugnell, edd., *The Books of Elijah*, I-II, Missoula 1979, in: *JSJ* 11 (1980), 223-224.
259. M.E. Stone, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions. A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts*, New York/London 1980, in: *JSJ* 11 (1980), 231.
260. G. Howard, *Paul: Crisis in Galatia. A Study in Early Christian Theology*, Cambridge 1979, in: *NTT* 34 (1980), 247-249.
261. F. Neirynck et alii, *Jean et les Synoptiques. Examen critique de l'exégèse de M.E. Boismard*, Leuven 1979, in: *NTT* 34 (1980), 327-329.
262. H.G. Kippenberg and G.A. Wevers, *Textbuch zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*, Göttingen 1979, in: *NTT* 34 (1980), 329-331.
263. H.N. Ridderbos, *Het Woord is vlees geworden*, Kampen 1979, in: *NTT* 34 (1980), 331.
264. H.J.B. Combrink, *Structural Analysis of Acts 6:8 - 8:3*, Kaapstad 1979, in: *NTT* 34 (1980), 331.
265. C. van der Waal, *Het Pascha van onze verlossing. De schriftverklaring in de Paaspreek van Melito van Sardes* [. . .], Johannesburg/Franeker 1979, in: *NTT* 35 (1981), 156-158.
266. E. von Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten. I. Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*, Leiden 1980, in: *JSJ* 12 (1981), 112-117.
267. M. Brecht, ed., *Text - Wort - Glaube* (FS K. Aland), Berlin/New York 1980, in: *NAK* 61 (1981), 214.
268. E. Haenchen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, Tübingen 1980, in: *NTT* 37 (1983), 151-153.
269. A. Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*. II, Stockholm 1982, in: *JSJ* 14 (1983), 70-80.
270. J. Carmignac, *Le mirage de l'eschatologie*, Paris 1979, in: *BiOr* 40 (1983), 249-251.
271. F.J. Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man*, Rome 1976, in: *NTT* 31 (1977), 253-254.
272. P. Ellingworth and E.A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Letters to the Thesalonians*, Stuttgart 1975, in: *The Bible Translator* 28 (1977), 344-347.
273. R.E. Brown, *The Epistles of John*, New York 1982, in: *The Bible Translator* 34 (1983), 346-347.
274. J.C. Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, Philadelphia 1980, in: *NTT* 37 (1983), 334-341.
275. A. Schweitzer, *Jesus. Capita selecta uit Schweitzer's theologie*, [edited by] C.J. den Heyer, The Hague 1981, in: *NTT* 38 (1984), 74-75.
276. K. Müller, *Das Judentum in der religionsgeschichtlichen Arbeit am Neuen Testament*, Frankfurt/Bern 1983, in: *JSJ* 15 (1984), 187-190.
277. J. Schaberg, *The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b*, Chico CA 1982, in: *JSJ* 15 (1984), 201-202.
278. C.J. den Heyer, *De messiaanse weg. I. Messiaanse verwachtingen in het Oude Testament en in de vroeg-joodse traditie*, Kampen 1983, in: *NTT* 39 (1985), 139-140.
279. T. Baarda, H. Jansen, S.J. Noorda, J.S. Vos, *Paulus en de andere Joden. Exegetische bijdragen en discussie*, Delft 1984, in: *NTT* 39 (1985), 144.
280. A.J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. 2nd edition, Philadelphia 1983, in: *NTT* 39 (1985), 143-144.
281. J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*, Cambridge 1985, in: *JSJ* 17 (1986), 241-242.
282. O. Camponovo, *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den frühjüdischen Schriften*, Freiburg (Schweiz)/Göttingen 1984, in: *NTT* 40 (1986), 337-338.
283. P.J. Achtemeier, general editor, et alii, edd., *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, San Francisco 1985, in: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986), 699-700.
284. W.G. Kümmel, *Dreissig Jahre Jesusforschung (1950-1980)*, edited by H. Merklein, Königstein/Ts. Bonn 1985, in: *NTT* 41 (1987), 79.

285. H. Baarlink, W.S. Duvekot, A. Geense, edd., *Vervulling en voleinding. De toekomstverwachting in het Nieuwe Testament*, Kampen 1985, in: *NTT* 41 (1987), 238-240.
286. C.J. den Heyer, *De messiaanse weg. II. Jezus van Nazareth*, Kampen 1986, in: *NTT* 43 (1989), 146-147.

I. INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Age of the Patriarchs 254
 'Amram document 153, 247-51
 Anointed high-priest, the 111, 137
 Anointed king(s) 33-5, 88, 99, 111-4
 Anointed one, my/his/your 88, 92, 98, 113
 Anointed one, *the* 33, 88, 95-8, 99, 100, 110, 113
 Anointed one from Aaron and Israel 31, 38, 39, 41, 42, 112
 Anointed of the Lord 10-1, 14-5, 21, 88, 89, 90, 99, 111, 112
 'Anointed' in Jewish sources 110-4, 137
 Anointed ones in Qumran 29-35, 41-2, 111-2
 Anointed prophet, Jesus as an 84, 116
 Anointed prophets 111, 116
 Anointed, especially used in connection with David and his descendants 137
 Antichrist, associated with Dan 214
 Aramaic Levi a source of Test. Levi? 253
 Athronges 114
 Atonement 132-4
 Atoning deaths 130-4, 290, 299
 Authenticity of words of Jesus (Mark 12:35-7) 144
 Azariah, prayer of 132
 Benjamin, associated with Paul 184, 215
 Blasphemy in Mark 14:64 69-70, 84
 Cairo Genizah 151-3; see also Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Cairo.
 Christ and king, relationship between these titles 82, 87
 Christ associated with Levi by Hippolytus 202
 Christ connected with both Levi and Judah 188, 197, 198-203, 217-9
 Christ's descent from Levi and Judah 217-9
 Christ, John's use of the title 80
 Christ, Luke's use of the title 79
 Christ, Mark's use of the title 74, 75, 81-2, 105-10, 115-6
 Christ according to Mark not a political agitator 110
 Christ, Matthew's use of the title 77
 Christ, Paul's use of the title 102-4
 Christ, pre-Markan use of the title 82-5, 105-6
 Christ, pre-Pauline use of the title 85, 103-4
 Christological titles in Mark 67-76
Christos avoided by Josephus 59, 113
Christos, Paul's use of 63-4, 84-5, 102-4
Christos, *ho*, in the Apocalypse 87-124
Christos, *ho*, became central title for Jesus 115, 117
Christos, *ho*, connected with Jesus' death and resurrection 64, 85, 103, 104
Christos, *ho*, in the death and resurrection formulas 103
Christos, *ho*, in the dying formula 64, 103
Christos, *ho*, in the *pistis* formula 103-4
Christos, *ho*, and the Son of David 115-7
Christos, *ho*, interpreted as Son of God 68, 81, 108, 115
Christos Kyrios in Ps. Sol. 17:32 14, 21; see also Index IIA *ad loc.*
 Commandments, Mosaic 270, 275; see also pre-Mosaic.
 Commandments, the two great 274-5
 Continency (sexual) 301-2
 Contradictions in Scripture 268
 Contrast-pattern in Acts 126
 'Copy of the Words of . . . ' 254
 Corporate christology 103-4
 Crucifixion of Jesus a stumbling block 125
 Cyrene, revolt in 61
 Damascus Document 116; see also Index IIE: CD.
 Dan connected with Antichrist 214-5
 David 10, 11, 33, 90, 108, 111, 113, 114; see also Son of David.
 David as a prophet and exorcist 115-6, 140
 Davidic king, expectation of a 111, 112, 113, 116, 137, 159; see also King, expectation of.
 Deutero-, Trito-Isaiah 65, 70n24, 116, 129; see also Index IIA: Isa. 40-66
 Dispersion of the Jews as punishment 211, 213
 'Dying for' 128-134, 295, 296
 Dying formula 128, 134, 296
 Egypt, prophet from 61, 62, 114
Eighteen Benedictions 14 113, 138
 Eleazar, Jewish martyr 130-1

- Eleazar, commander of Massada 57-8, 60
 Elect of God, the 43-7, 113
 Elijah 73
entellomai 254
 Ephraim and Manasse, types of Gentile and Jewish Christians 209
 'Eschatological' as a term 15, 28
 Eschatological remnant 272
 Essenes' attitude toward marriage 307-9
 Essenic prophets 62n40
 Expectation, national and cosmic 23, 112
 Expectation of Jesus as priest-king 198-203
 Expiatory deaths 130-4, 290, 299
 'Geschick der Propheten, das gewalt-same' 126, 213
 Give one's life for 128-34, 296
 Hasmonaeans 9
 High priest, anointed 30-3, 111-2
 High priest of the future 37-9, 41, 111, 159, 162, 174
 High priest and king, Kohath 248
 Highpriestly race, Christians the true 262
 Hippolytus and Test. XII Patr., parallels between 202, 205-19
 Hippolytus' use of Test. XII Patr. not proved 216
 Hiskia 59-60
 Irenaeus 167, 204, 260, 272-4; see also Index IIF.
 Irenaeus on pre-Mosaic commandments 272-4
 Isaac, binding of 130
 Israel's share in the Christians' salvation 275; see also Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Jews; Salvation of Israel.
 Jesus as the anointed by the Spirit 116, 137
 Jesus as a Davidic prophet-exorcist 115, 140
 Jesus' death for others 125-34, esp. 128ff.
 Jesus as God's final envoy 126, 134, 213
 Jesus was called Messiah before Easter 140
 Jesus as priest a descendant of Levi 218
 Jesus as a prophet rejected by Israel 126
 Jesus, rebel against Roman government 66
 Jesus' self-understanding 117; see also 'Messiah' used by Jesus?
 Jesus as Son of David 135-41
 Jesus as a healer was called Son of David 140-1
 Jesus as Solomonic Son of David 116, 123, 140-1
 Jesus as Son of God 141-4
 Jesus as Son of Man 139
 Jesus as suffering righteous one 126
 Jewish traditions known to Christians 215
 Jews will be saved if they believe in Christ 210-1; see also: Israel's share.
 Joakim, ancestor of Jesus 217
 Johannine studies, M. de Jonge's XVIII-XIX
 John's christology 80-1
 Jonathan the weaver 61
 Joseph a type of Jesus 208, 211-2, 242-3, 283-5, 297
 Joseph an example of virtue 212, 243, 290-9
 Josephus 48-62, 113-4, 307-9; see also following entries and Index IID.
 Josephus avoids *christos* 59, 113
 Josephus on Daniel 2 54-5
 Josephus as a prophet 48-53
 Josephus' view of himself 48-51
 Josephus' view of history 48, 58
 Josephus did not regard Vespasian as a messiah 53
 Jubilees, calender in 251
 Jubilees, date 250, 251
 Jubilees, provenance of; sources of 250, 251
 Jubilees, source of Test. Levi? 252
 Judah, ancestor of future saviour-king 214
 Judas ben Hiskia 59-60
 Judas the Galilean 60, 114
 Justin Martyr 167, 204, 214n48, 238, 260, 267-76; see also Index IIF.
 Justin's doctrine of Holy Scripture 267-70
 Justin on pre-Mosaic commandments 267-70
 Justin on the resurrection 270-2
 King, Jesus as 84; see also Christ and king; Kingship; Royal; Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Christ.
 King of Israel, Jesus as 72, 109
 King of the Jews, Jesus called 71, 77, 79, 80, 83, 104, 109

- King, expectation of a future 11-2, 13, 33-5, 41, 111-2, 113, 173, 174; see also Davidic.
- Kingship of God 8, 11, 12, 13, 62, 90, 98, 99, 100
- Kingship, Jesus' future 69, 71, 74, 75, 80, 81, 85, 87, 90, 97, 98, 100, 108, 109, 139, 173, 174, 196, 197
- Kingship, wrong concept of Jesus' 138
- Kingship, participation of believers in Jesus' future 100-1, 176
- Law in Test. Levi, the 180-90
- Law, tripartite division of the 268
- 'Lehreröffnungsformel' 254
- Levi, prayer of 151, 195-6, 246, 252, 256
- Luke's christology 78-80
- Mark's christology 66-76, 115ff.
- Marriage, the purpose of 301-13
- Martyrs, Maccabean 130-4
- Matthew's christology 77-8
- Menahem 59, 60, 114
- 'Messiah' as a term 110
- Messiah, the absolute use of the term 110
- Messiah, designation of Jesus as, before Easter 140
- 'Messiah' used by Jesus as a self-designation? 64, 104, 107, 117
- Messiah, prophetic 65
- Messiah, royal 65, 66, 112
- 'Messiah' not the central messianic title in Jewish eschatological expectation 65, 110, 111
- Messiah in Test. XII Patr. 159, 191-203
- Messiahs in Qumran, two 191, 192
- Messiahship, wrong concept of Jesus' 138
- 'Messianic' and '-nism' as terms 15, 28, 110
- Messianic pretenders 59-62, 113
- Moses' Law not necessary for salvation 270, 275
- 'Naherwartung' 10
- 'New Quest' of the historical Jesus 104
- Old Testament, Christian exegesis of 206-7
- Parenesis in the N.T. and in Test. XII Patr. 277-89
- Passion, predictions of Jesus' 127
- 'Patriarchs,' the term in Irenaeus 274
- 'Patriarchs,' the term in Justin 270
- Patriarchs exhorted their descendants to take God's commandments seriously and to believe in Christ 211; see also Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Christianity
- Paul associated with Benjamin 184, 215, 267
- Philo's ideas on marriage 310-1
- Philo on natural law 274
- Phinehas 258
- Phinehas, atonement by 132
- Phinehas, exemplary zeal of 196
- Pompey 7-8, 9, 19-20, 224
- Prayer of Azariah 132
- Procreation, the purpose of marriage 301-13
- Popular messianic movements 114
- Pre-Mosaic commandments and Christian ethics XIV, 204-19, 231, 238, 269-70, 272-4, 285, 287
- Priest of the future 40, 41, 61, 170, 173, 184, 188, 256
- Priest and king, Christ the new 188, 198-203
- Priest-king 198-203, 256-7
- Priests, all Christians are 262
- Prince of the future 41, 173, 174, 188; see also King, expectation of
- Prophet from Egypt 61, 62, 114
- Prophet of the future 40, 41, 112
- Prophet, Jesus as a 74, 84, 213
- Prophet anointed by/with H. Spirit 65, 112, 116
- 'Propheten, das gewaltsame Geschick der' 126, 213
- Prophets, anointed 29-30, 112
- Prophets, false 61, 109
- Psalms of Solomon 3-27, 74; see also Index IIA.
- Psalms of Solomon, history in 6-8, 13
- Qumran 28-47, 111-2, 151-4, 180, 191-2, 244-62; see also Index IIE.
- Rachel 301-13
- Ransom, life as a 133-4; see also Atoning, Expiatory deaths.
- Reconciliation between God and his people 131-4; see also Atonement.
- Resurrection of martyrs 132-3
- Resurrection in Test. XII Patr. 159; see also Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Resurrection.
- Royal connotations of the title of Christ 108-9
- Royal features in Jesus' activity 76, 139-40

- Royal Messiah 65-6, 112
 Salvation for Jews who repent 210, 275;
 see also Testaments of the Twelve
 Patriarchs: Jews; Salvation.
 Samaria, riot in 61, 114
 Schnapp, Friedrich 233-4, 277
 Servant anointed by H. Spirit 65
 Sex, sexuality 301-13
Shemoneh 'Esreh 14 113, 138
 Sicarians 61
 Simeon a type of Jesus' murderers 213
 Simon bar Gioras 60, 114
 Simon bar Koseba 59
 Social background of messianic move-
 ments 114
 Solomon(ic) 6, 18, 68, 74, 84, 116
 Solomon, exorcistic Son of David 116,
 123, 140
 'Son' in John's Gospel 81
 Son of David 9, 10, 11, 33, 35, 68, 74,
 75, 76, 81, 84, 108, 110, 111, 115,
 116, 136-44
 Son of God 68, 69, 72, 74, 75, 76, 78,
 80, 81, 101, 109, 110, 136
 Son of God, title connected with David
 143
 Son of God, designation for the exem-
 plary righteous one 127, 143
 Son of God, title for God's unique en-
 voy 143
 Son, my (*i.e.*, God's), in IV Ezra
 101n47
 Son of Man 68, 73, 74, 113, 139
 Suffering righteous vindicated by God
 126, 133
 Surrender formulas 128-30, 296
 Susanna, daughter of Hilkia 217
 Teacher of Righteousness 38-9, 40, 122
 Temple veil, the rending of the 170,
 185, 220-31
 Testaments of Judah and Joseph 152
 Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs
 XI-XIV, 147-353
 related Aramaic and Hebrew ma-
 terial 151-5, 169, 180, 184, 193,
 202, 244-62; see also Levi,
 Aramaic, and Index IIB (end)
 and E.
 Armenian version 148, 150-1, 283,
 291-6
 Cairo Genizah material 151-5,
 169, 180, 193, 196, 199, 202,
 236, 244-5; see also Index IIB
 (end).
- (*Text. XII Patr.*)
 Cambridge fragment of Aramaic
 Levi 196, 252n38; see also Index
 IIB (end).
 Change from first pers. sing. to
 plural 260-1
 Christ's future kingship 173, 174,
 188, 198
 Christ's parousia 167, 170, 171,
 172, 174, 175, 186
 Christ rejected by sons of Asher
 and Levi 162, 168, 169, 170-1,
 178, 183
 Christ the new high priest (not
 from Levi) and new king to
 come 188, 197-203, 217, 257,
 259
 Christ renewer of the Law 186,
 187, 211, 238, 258, 259, 260,
 287
 Christian elements 159, 160-3,
 171, 172, 174, 183, 184, 186,
 187, 197, 212, 221, 223-4, 239,
 242, 258, 267, 285, 296-7
 Christian form has to be taken as a
 document in its own right 177-
 178, 181, 192, 198, 221, 235-6,
 237, 264
 Christian interpolation 235
 Christian redaction 241, 255, 264,
 282-3, 292
 represent Christianity as teaching
 pre-Mosaic ethics XIV, 204-19,
 231, 238, 265-75, 287-8
 Composed in Greek 155, 193
 Composition 155-60
 Continuity between Hellenistic
 Judaism and early Christianity,
 testify to 289, 292, 313
 Date 178, 231, 234, 255
 Enoch 183, 186, 286, 296
 Ethics, neither specifically Chris-
 tian nor specifically Jewish 158,
 264, 280-2, 313; see also Parene-
 sis.
 Ethics, generally Hellenistic-Jew-
 ish 260, 280-2, 313
 Ethics, not Mosaic 274-5, 286
 Ethics, partly christianized 285,
 289
 Ethics, theological purpose of the
 265-75
 Expectation of the future is consis-
 tently Christian 204, 238-40

(*Text. XII Patr.*)

Expectation of a high priest 174
 Expectation of a king 174
 Functioned meaningfully for
 Christians 274, 291
 Future of Israel 164-79, 238-40,
 287-8; see also Salvation; Jews.
 Greek text 148-51
 Greek text, date of 151, 235
 Hebrew material see Aramaic,
 Naphtali, and Index IIB (end).
 Jewish-Christian? 215-6, 230-1,
 240
 Jewish or Christian? 234-43, 264,
 292, 313
 Jews will be saved if they believe in
 Christ 238-40, 275, 287-8; see
 also Salvation of Israel.
 Johannine phrases 242
 Kingship, Jesus' future 174
 'Lamb of God' in 296
 the Law renewed by Christ 186,
 187, 211, 238, 287
 the Law, view of the 287
 the Law in Test. Levi 183-4, 186,
 187
 Levi, Aramaic 151-5, 158, 180,
 184, 185, 193, 195, 202, 244-62,
 see also Index IIB (end) and E.
 Levi, Aramaic, date of 255
 Levi, Aramaic, provenance of 256
 Levi document, *an* earlier 157,
 169, 180, 187, 193, 195, 201,
 245ff., 252, 255, 289
 Levi, Syriac 151-2
 Levi, Prayer of 151, 195-6, 246,
 252-6
 Levi-Judah (L.J.) passages 156,
 159, 173, 173-5, 194-8, 239
 Levi and Judah, special position of
 192-203, 259
 Levi superior to Judah 195, 259
 Levitical character of Test. Levi
 261
 Literary criticism failing to con-
 vince 160, 181, 193, 198, 200-1,
 234, 259, 264, 279-80, 292
 Messiah 159
 two Messiahs? (no) 191-203
 Midrash Wayyissa'u 152
 Moses mentioned only once 286
 Naphtali, Hebrew Test. 152, 153,
 172
 Parenthesis, neither Jewish nor

(*Text. XII Patr.*)

Christian 158-9, 236, 264, 280-2
 Parenthesis, partly christianized 285,
 289
 Parenthesis compared with that in
 N.T. 277-89
 Patriarchs, the, as exemplary ser-
 vants of God 167
 Paul 184, 215, 267
 Prayer of Levi see Levi, Prayer of.
 Pre-Christian form, did it ever ex-
 ist? 241, 292
 Predictions of the future 159, 161
 Provenance 264
 Purpose: parenetic 158, 211n32,
 231, 239, 275
 Purpose: missionary, *sc.* the salva-
 tion of the Jews 179, 274-5
 Purpose: not missionary 275
 Purpose: neither polemic nor
 apologetic 240, 274-5
 Purpose of the parenthesis 265
 Qumran, related material from
 151-5, 193, 236; and see Index
 IIE.
 Qahat material 153, 247-51, 254
 Readers, intended 179, 240
 Resurrection, general 167, 186,
 266, 267
 Resurrection of the Patriarchs
 159, 167-8, 171, 174, 186, 238,
 266-7
 Salvation of Israel, concern for
 173, 174, 178, 238-40, esp. 239,
 275, 287-288
 Salvation of 'mankind' 165, 174
 Salvation for those who have erred
 162, 168, 238-40
 Salvation, universalist concept of
 168, 173, 174, 175, 176, 187,
 198, 238-9, 271
 'Saviour of the World' 296
 Significance for Christians of 2nd
 cent. 274
 Sin-Exile-Return (S.E.R.) pas-
 sages 156, 157, 159, 161, 162,
 164-5, 168-73, 175, 182-3, 186,
 223, 239, 257
 Sins committed against Christ
 186, 211, 223, 239, 257, 259,
 260
 Testimonies for, ancient 150
 Theological consistency of 239-41,
 265-75, 292

- Theudas 114, cf. 61
Torah, the, in the new era 39, 40, 112;
 see also Law, the.
Tripartite division of the Law 268
Typology 207
Typology in Test. XII Patr. 212
'Uncovering someone's shame' 224
Verbum sui ipsius interpres 207
Vicarious suffering 290, 299; see also
 Expiatory, Atoning.
Vindication (rehabilitation) by God 58,
 68, 92-3, 96, 107, 126, 127, 133, 186
Vindication of Jesus by God 125,
 126-8, 144
Word of God see Verbum.
Zealots 56-7

II. INDEX OF PASSAGES

A. BIBLE

(including LXX)

Gen.

22:1-19 130

30:14-24 301

Lev.

4:3,5,16 111

6:15 111

Num.

25:13 132

1 Sam.

16:13 115, 140

16:14-23 140

2 Sam.

7:12 142, 144

7:14 112, 144

23:1-7 115, 140

1 Kings

19:16 111

1 Chron.

17:13 142

Psalms

2 90, 144

2:1-2 99

2:2 99, 113

2:8-9 91

16:8-10 115

22 127

22:2 127

22:8-9 77

22:8 72

69 127

89 144

105:15 111

110:1 69, 75, 81, 85, 108, 115, 138-9, 144

118:22-3 126

Wisdom

2:12-20 127, 143

2:17-20 127

2:17 f. 72, 78

5:1-7 127, 143

Ps. Sol.

2 7-8, 9

11 6

17 6, 8-9, 10, 11-2, 14-5, 35, 112

17:4 142

17:21-25 137

17:21 137, 142

17:32 88, 99, 112, 116

18 6, 10, 14-5, 16, 88, 99

Isaiah

11:1-5 112, 115

40-66 116

52:7 112, 116

52:13-53:12 129, 212, 296

53 296

53:11-12 129

53:12 LXX 129

61:1 111, 112, 116

65:17-25 271

Daniel

3 126

3:28 127

3:38-40 132

6 126

6:25-7 127

7:9 96

7:13 68, 108

7:14 108

7:21, 25 127

7:22 96

9:24-7 183

11:29-35 127

12:1-3 127

Susanna

1-2 217

2 Maccabees

6:12-7 131

6:18-31 130

6:28 131

6:30 131

7 130

7:9 132

7:11 132

7:14 132

7:18 131

7:23 131, 132

7:29 132

7:32 131

7:36 132

7:37-8 131

8:1-7 131

8:4 296

4 Maccabees

1:11 133

5-7 130

6:27-9 133

6:27 131

7:14 130

7:18-9 133

8-18 130

13:12 130
 13:17 133
 17:21-2 133
 18:1-2 132
 18:3-4 133
 18:6-19 132
 18:11-3 133
 18:11 130
 18:23-4 133

Matthew

8:17 129
 11:2-6 116
 12:22-3 140
 12:38-42 140
 19:28 100
 20:28 128
 22:41-6 136
 23:34-6 126
 23:37-9 126
 26:28 242, 297
 26:59-67 77
 26:68 77
 27:39-43 77, 127
 27:40 72
 27:43 72
 27:45, 51ff. 220
 27:46 127
 27:51-3 220, 225
 27:51 225
 27:54 78

Mark

1:1 76, 105-6
 1:11 76, 106, 144
 1:14-5 117
 3:11 144
 5:7 144
 8:27-9:1 73
 8:29 106
 8:31 127
 8:38-9:1 144
 8:38 107
 9:1 127
 9:2-8 107
 9:7 76, 144
 9:9-13 138
 9:31 127
 9:41 76, 106, 107
 10:32-4 127
 10:45 128, 129
 10:46-52 116, 138, 140, 144
 10:46-12:44 74, 81
 11:9-10 138
 11:10 144

12:1-12 108
 12:1-9 126, 143
 12:6 144
 12:22-3 140
 12:35-7 75, 100, 108, 136-41, 143-4
 12:35 138
 12:36 81, 115
 13:21 76
 13:21-2 109, 110
 13:26-7 127
 13:32 144
 14:22-5 129
 14:24 129, 242, 297
 14:53-15:47 67-76
 14:55-64 83
 14:55-65 68-70, 74, 80
 14:58-59 84
 14:61-2 76, 81, 84, 100, 108, 139, 144
 14:62 127, 128
 14:64 69
 15:1-27 70, 76, 81, 82, 83
 15:1-26, 32 109, 110
 15, 26 66
 15:28-39 72
 15:29-32 127, 143
 15:31-32 138
 15:34 127, 143
 15:38 220
 15:39 72, 76, 82, 109, 144

Luke

1:32, 35 143
 2:10-1 13
 2:29 213
 4:16-21 116
 4:18-9 137
 4:18 117
 7:18-23 117
 11:49-51 126
 13:34-5 126
 22:28-30 100
 22:37 129
 22:54-65 78
 22:63-71 78
 22:69 80
 23:1-5 79
 23:35-7 79
 23:39-43 80
 23:44-8 220

John

1:29, 36 242, 296
 3:16-7 143
 4:42 242, 296
 12:38 129
 18:28-38 80

18:39 80

19:7 80

19:8-11 80

19:12-6 80

19:14-5 80

Acts

1:16 115, 140

2:23-4, 36 126

2:29 138

2:30 140

2:34-6 139

2:36 142

3:13-5 126

4:10 126

4:11 126

4:25-6 99, 115

4:25 138, 140

5:30-1 126

7:8 274

8:32-5 129

9:20, 22 143

10:38 116, 137

10:39-40 126

11:26 63, 104

13:27-31 126

13:33 142

Romans

1:3-4 141-4

1:3 143

1:32 278n4

3:8 275

3:24 128

4:1 143

4:25 128, 129

5:6, 8 128

6:2, 8-10 128

8:3-4 143

8:32 128

9:3 143

9:5 102, 143

10:16 129

14:9 128

14:15 128

15:21 129

1 Corinthians

1:13 128

1:18-31 84-5

1:23 102

7:5 306

8:11 128

11:23-26 129

15:3 128

15:20-8 108

15:22-8 100

15:24-5 85

2 Corinthians

1:22f. 116

5:14, 15 128

5:21 128

Galatians

1:4 128

2:20 128

2:21 128

3:13 103, 128

4:4 143

Ephesians

5:2, 25 128

1 Thessalonians

2:14-6 126

5:10 128

1 Timothy

2:6 128

2 Timothy

1:10 297

2:10-2 100

Titus

2:14 128

Hebrews

2:14 297

6:19 220

7 203, 218

9:3 220

9:20 242, 297

10:20 220

10:29 242, 297

13:20 242, 297

1 Peter

1:19 296

2:9 262

2:21-5 129

2:21 128

2:22 296

3:18 128

1 John

4:6 143

4:14 242, 296

Revelation

11:15-9 88-91

11:15 87-91, 98, 99

12:10-2 91-4

12:10 88, 98, 99

20:4-6 94-8, 271

20:4 88, 101

20:6 88, 101

B. TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

Testament Reuben

- 1:2 254
 2:1-2 305
 2:4 305, 309
 3:9-4:11 212
 3:10-4 305
 4:1 305
 4:6 289
 4:8-10 304-5
 5 307, 309
 6:8 196, 198, 289
 6:11-2 258
 6:12 196, 198
 6 195
 Testament Simeon
 1:1 254
 4:4 284
 5:4-6 194, 197
 6:6-7 174
 6:7 266
 7:1-2 174, 197, 198
 7:1 198
 7:2 202, 239
 Testament Levi
 1:1 254
 2-5; 8 257
 2:3 in *MS ϵ* 151-2, 155, 180, 193, 202,
 236, 252
 2:4 252
 2:9-12 187
 2:10-1 161, 171
 2:10 170, 257, 259
 2:10b 163
 2:11 174, 197, 239
 2:13 252n39
 4:1 222
 4:2-6 186, 187
 4:2ff. 252
 4:2-3 257
 4:3-5 161-2
 4:4-6 257
 4:4-5 163
 4:4 170, 186, 196, 257, 284, 289
 4:5 257
 4:6 187
 5-7 213
 5 194
 5:1-4 258
 5:2 170, 187, 195, 196, 257, 289
 5:2 in *MS ϵ* 245n6, 246n12, 256
 5:4-5 258
 5:4 286
 6:3 252, 258
 7:1-2 239
 8 187
 8:1-10 257
 8:2 239
 8:3 257
 8:4, 7, 9 258
 8:11-15 257, 289
 8:14 188, 198
 8:16-7 257
 9 185, 258
 9:1 259
 9:6-14 252, 289
 9:6-8 254
 9:13-4 252
 10; 14-5; 16 180-90, 223, 239, 253,
 257
 10 162, 168, 169, 182-3, 185-6, 187,
 196
 10:1-2 171
 10:1 285
 10:2 162, 169, 185, 186, 223, 258
 10:3 185, 221, 223-4, 230
 10:4 223
 11-2 185, 253
 12-3 253
 12:6-7 253
 13 184, 196, 258, 260
 14-6 163
 14-5 162, 168, 169, 182-3, 186, 187,
 196
 14 184
 14:1 183
 14:2-5 162
 14:2-3 186
 14:3-4 169, 183, 253
 14:3 258
 14:4 258, 260, 287
 14:5 182
 14:6 288
 15:1-3 169, 184
 15:1 258
 15:4 162, 169, 182, 184, 188
 16 162, 169, 170, 182-3, 186-7, 196
 16:2-3 162, 186
 16:2 258
 16:3 187, 260, 287
 16:4 258
 16:5 182, 188, 239
 17 170, 253, 257
 18 162, 184, 188, 196, 198-202, 253,
 257-8
 18:1-2 188
 18:1 199
 18:2 180, 198, 246
 18:3 198, 257
 18:4 257

18:8-11 257
 18:9 165, 171, 187
 18:14 239, 266
 19 260
 19:1-3 170, 187
 19:1 258, 260
 19:2-3 261
 19:3 260
 19:4-5 260
 Testament Judah
 1:1 254
 5:7-8a 194
 10:3 288
 15:5-6 307
 17:5 259
 18:1 173
 19:1 289
 21:1-6a 194, 197
 22:2 174, 239
 22:3 174, 198
 23:1-5 173
 24 173, 198, 200-1
 24:1 188, 199, 200
 24:2-3 173
 24:2 199, 200
 24:3-4 199
 24:4 200
 24:5-6 200
 24:5 199, 200
 24:6 173, 200
 25 186, 238, 266
 25:3 266
 25:5 167, 266
 Testament Issachar
generatim 158
 1:3-15 301
 2 313
 2:1-5 301
 2:1, 3 303, 306
 3:6 289
 5:2 278
 5:3 289
 6:1-4 173
 7:6 278
 7:7 173
 Testament Zebulun
 1:1 254
 3:4 286
 8 284
 8:2 284
 9-10 171, 239
 9:5-8 171, 182
 9:8-9 186
 10 266

10:1-4 238
 10:1-3 171
 10:2 167, 186, 238
 Testament Dan
 5:2-3 278
 5:4-9 173
 5:4 182, 194, 197
 5:5-7 197
 5:5 288
 5:6-9 177, 182
 5:6 239
 5:8-9 197
 5:10-6:10 175, 197
 5:10b-13 173, 177
 5:13 284
 5:10 174, 197, 197-8, 198, 239
 6 176-7
 6:8-9 239
 6:9 284, 287
 6:10 239
 7:3 235
 Testament Naphtali
 4 171, 172, 239
 4:1-3, 4-6 182
 4:5 172, 239, 284
 5:8 172
 6:9-10 172
 7:1 172
 8:2 174, 198
 8:8 306
 Testament Gad
 8:1 174, 198, 239
 Testament Asher
 2:10 286
 6:2 278n4
 7 171-2, 239
 7:1-7 161
 7:2-4, 5-7 182
 7:3-5 186
 7:5 286, 287
 7:7 162, 182
 Testament Joseph
 3-9 154
 3:3 254
 10-18 284
 10:1 289
 17:8 284
 18:3 275, 288
 18:5 289
 19:6 198, 239
 Testament Benjamin
 3-8 212, 242, 280, 284
 3:8 239, 242-3, 283, 290-9
 4-6 280

4-5 284
 9:3-5 221
 9:4 221, 225, 230
 10 237-8, 274-5
 10:2-11 285
 10:4-11 167
 10:4-5 267, 285
 10:4, 6 254-5
 10:6-10 186, 238, 266, 267
 10:6-7 275
 10:7-10 275
 10:7 275, 284
 10:8-11 165
 10:8-9 275
 10:8 239
 10:10 239
 10:11 178, 239, 275
 11 184, 215
 MS Koutloumous 39 (*e*)
 T. Levi 2:3 245-6, 252, and see T.
 Levi 2:3 above.
 T. Levi 5:2 245n6, 246n12, 256
 Bodleian Aramaic Levi
 col. a 256; see also Aramaic Levi
 below.
 Cambridge Aramaic Levi
 col. a 252n38
 col. b 252n38
 col. c, 5-7 196
 See also Aramaic Levi.
 Aramaic Levi
 6,18 256
 7-8 256
 12-32 252
 13-61 256
 16-18 256
 18 256
 29 252n39
 48-50 256
 58-61 256
 67-8 248
 74-7 248
 81 248, 249, 250n29, 253, 254
 82-95 256
 82-84 249-50
 82 249, 253, 254
 83 254
 90 250
 See also Index I, Testaments of the
 Twelve Patriarchs, *ad* Levi, Aramaic
 T. Napht, Medieval Hebrew
 3:13 172
 7:4 172

C. OLD TESTAMENT
 APOCRYPHA AND
 PSEUDEPIGRAPH
 except Testaments of the Twelve
 Patriarchs
 Assumption of Moses
 1:16-8 249n25
 Syr. Baruch
 6-8 226n28
 29:2 100
 29:3 88, 113
 30:1 88, 113
 39:7 88, 99, 113
 40:1 88, 113
 40:2 100
 40:3 99
 48:48-50 127
 52:6-7 127
 70:9 88, 113
 71:1 100
 72:2 88, 113
 73:1 99
 (Ps.-Philo) Biblical Antiquities
 18:5 130
 32:2-4 130
 40:2 130
 59 115
 59-60 140
 1 Enoch
 1-36 251
 9:4 90
 48:10 88, 99, 113
 52:4 88, 99, 113
 72-82 251
 99 46
 102-104 127
 IV Ezra
 7:28 99, 101n47
 7:29 88
 12:32 88, 113
 12:34 99
 Jubilees
 7:38-9 249
 10:14, 17 249
 21:10 249
 31 196, 259
 31:5-11 259
 31:18-20 259
 39:6-7 254

45:16 248

Lives of the Prophets

Hab. 11-13 226n28

Hab. 12 222-3

Pseudo-Phocylides

186 308n22

Sibylline Oracles

1,372-82 222

8,305-12 222

D. FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS

Jewish Antiquities

1,222-36 130

4,114-7 55

4,119-58 55

4,261 309

6,166-8 115, 140

10,267 53

14,159 60

15,371 307

17,271f. 59

18,1-10, 23-25 60

18,11-25 307

18,21 308

18,63f. 59, 113

18,85-7 61

20,97-9 61

20,167f. 61

20,169-72 61

20,200 59, 113

Jewish War

1,204 60

2,56 59

2,117f. 60

2,119-66 307-9

2,258-60 61

2,262 62

2,264 61

2,433 60

2,444-8 59

3,350-4 48

3,352 50

3,354 49

3,400-2 49

3,408 49

4,147-57 56-7

4,510 60

4,575 60

4,623 49

4,626 49

4,629 49

5,362-419 53-4, 226n28

5,391f. 50

5,403 55

6,98-110 55-6

6,284 51

6,285-315 50, 51-3, 226n28

6,291 52

6,299-300 226, 231

6,311-14 52-3

6,312 59

7,323-36 57

7,341-88 58

7,437ff. 61

Against Apion

2,190-219 308

E. QUMRAN

CD

II,12 29, 122

V,21-VI, 1 29, 122

VI,10f. 38, 41

VI,11 38, 40

VII,9-VIII, 2 42

VII,18 38, 39, 40

XII, 23f. 31, 38, 41, 111-2

XIV,17f. 41

XIV,19 31, 111-2

XIX,10f. 31, 38, 42, 111-2

XIX,35-XX,1 38, 42, 111-2

XX,1 31, 38

1Q21

1-60 244

1, 3, 4 256

1 196

1QH

III,7-18 42

1QM

generatim 35, 36, 40

V,1 31, 112

XI,7f. 29, 122

XII,9f. 35

1QpHab

II,8 40

II,9f. 39

VII,1 39

1QS

III,13-IV,26 35, 36

IX,10f. 38, 41
IX,11 30, 31, 33, 38, 40, 111, 112

1QSa
generatim 35
II,11-22 30, 33, 40
II,11-2 112
II,12 110
II,14; 20 112

1QSb
generatim 35
V,20ff. 33, 112

3Q7,6 and 5 + 3 247

4Q161
8-10, 20-1 112

4Q484 247

4QAha 41

4Q'Amram 247-51, 254
4Q'Amram^b 250

4Qflor
7-13 112
11 31, 33, 35, 39, 40
18-9 41, 99n41

4QMess Ar 43-7

4Qpatr
generatim 35
3 33, 112

4QpIs^a
generatim 35
C, D 33
D, 7 30, 35, 39, 40

4QQahat 247-51, 254

4Qtest
generatim 30
5-8 40, 122
17-8 40

4QTest Benj 247n20

4QTest Levi^a 244, 250
8 iii 169, 180, 183

4Q214 Test Levi^b 244

4QTest Napht
1 II,4-5 152, 246

11QMelch
generatim 35
18 29, 30, 112, 116

11QPs^a 115, 140

F. CHRISTIAN AUTHORS

Alexander of Alexandria (attr.),
Sermo de anima et corpore etc. 227-8

Ambrose,
De Iosepho 2(8) 208n24

Athanasius (attr.),
Homily, ed. Budge, p. 422 227

Athenagoras,
Suppl., 33,1-2 312

Barnabas (Ps.-),
5:6 297

Cyril of Alexandria,
In Ioannis Evangelium XII, MPG 74,676
229

Fragm. 315 on Mt. 27:51, ed. Reuss
229

Cyril of Jerusalem,
Cat. Myst. III,6 262n69

Didascalia Apostolorum
XXIII 225

Ephraim Syrus,
Commentary on the Diatessaron XXI,4 and
6 225
Commentary on Genesis 43:1 215

Eusebius,
Chronica, ed. Helm p. 175 226
Comm. in Isaiam, MPG 24, 92-3 226
Comm. in Lucam, MPG 24, 605B 226
Dem. Ev. VIII,119 226n27
Ecl. Proph. III,48 226n27
Hist. Eccl. III,8,1-9 226n27

Hilary of Poitiers,
Comm. in Matth. 33,7 227

- Tract. in Ps. LVIII*, 10 227
- Hippolytus,
Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses
205-19
on Gen. 37 297
on Gen. 49:8-12 202
on Gen. 49:16-8 214
on Deut. 33:8-11 202
Comm. on Daniel 1:12 217
De Elcana et Hanna, fragm. I 218n66
- Irenaeus,
Adversus Haereses,
IV, 13-6 238, 265, 272
IV, 15,2 272
IV, 22,2 275
V, 30,2 214
Fragm. Achelis LII 215n53
- Jerome,
Quaest. in Gen. 1,43 (on Gen. 3:8)
309n23
- John Chrysostom,
De coemeterio et cruce, MPG 49,397 229
- Justin Martyr,
Apolog. I
29,1 311
32,1-2 214n48
54,5 214n48
Dialog.
11,2 238, 270
19,3f. 270
25,6 271
26,1 238, 271, 275
44,2 268
45,2, 4 270, 271
45,3 269, 271
45,4 238, 268, 270
46,2-4 269
52,2 214n48
80-81 271
93,1-3 269, 270
102,7 296
103,2 296
110,6 296
116,3 262
120,3 214n48
120,5 271
130,1-2 271
142 272
- Melito of Sardes,
On the Pasch
98, 100, 101-2 222
98 227, 231
New Georgian fragm. II 222, 227
- Minucius Felix,
Oct. 31,5 311
- Origen,
Comm. on Matth. 27:51-3 228
In Ezech. Hom. IV,4 215n53
In Iesu Nave Hom. XV,6 204n5, 235,
263
In Leviticum Hom. IX,9 262
Fragm. 560 ed. Klostermann-Benz 228
- Polycarp,
Philipp. 5:2 100
- Proclus,
Oratio 11, MPG 65,785B 229
- Protevangelium Iacobi*,
24:3 229n47
- (Ps.-?) Chrysostom,
Fragment on Matt. 27:50-3, ed. Pous-
sines 229-30
- Ps.-Chrysostom,
In ascensionem Hom. III 227
- Ps.-Clement,
Recognitiones I 41,3 228-9
- Ps.-Cyprian,
Adv. Iudaeos 4 228
- (Ps.-?) Hippolytus,
On the Passion, ed. Nautin, p. 183 229
- Ps.-Irenaeus,
Fragm. XVII on Deut. 33 215n53,
217
Fragm. LXXXI 215n53
- Sedulius,
Carmen Paschale V, 270-5 229
- Sextus,
Sententiae
67-72 313

230a-240 312
 253b 313
 438 313

Tertullian,
Adv. Marc.
 III, 18 213n47
 IV, 42 226
 V, 1 215n53
Adv. Iudaeos
 X 213n47
 XIII, 15 225
De baptismo
 VIII, 1 262
Scorpiace
 13 215n53

G. OTHER GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS

Iamblichus,
De vita pythagorica 210 302n5

Musonius Rufus,
 Fragm. 11 303
 Fragm. 12 302
 Fragm. 14 310n29

Ocellus Lucanus,
De universi natura 44-45 302

Philo,
De opificio mundi 161 310
De spec. leg. 3:32, 34-6, 112 310
 apud Eus., *Prep. Ev.* 8.11.1-18 308

Pliny,
Nat. Hist. 5,17 308n19

Seneca,
 Fragm. *De matrimonio* 302, 308n21

Tacitus,
Historiae 5,13 226, 231

H. RELIQUA
Eighteen Benedictions,
 14 113, 138

Mishna,
 Yebam. 6:5-6 311

Second Treatise of the Great Seth
 N.H.L. VII,2 228